













by M. W. Fodor  
SOUTH OF HITLER

# THE REVOLUTION IS ON

BY

M. W. FODOR

LONDON

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1941

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED  
PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN  
*in 12-Point Fournier Type*  
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED  
WOKING

## INTRODUCTION

By Dorothy Thompson

WE are bound to get very soon a series of books on the current war, whether written by theoreticians, eye-witnesses, or propagandists and special pleaders. This one has the merit of being one of the first. It also has the merit—and, naturally, the handicap—of having been written down hastily, on the run, as it were, with the approaching German armies at the author's back. The merit of such a book is that it captures the moment and records the immediate impression. Weeks or months later that is gone. The handicap is the one for ever attending the work of the journalist: the lack of time for contemplation, for rumination, for getting right through to the basic explanations of things. Thus, I find this book most interesting in the chapters describing the "war of nerves," the actual *Blitzkrieg*, the swift few days' course of the battles of Belgium and France, the author's own experiences, the facts concerning the operation of the Fifth Column.

Mr. Fodor wrote this book in large part for information and warning. It adds to the revelations we already have regarding the great rôle played by propaganda, duplicity, bribery, "inside work," cynicism, and revolutionary fervour in this strange war. Mr. Fodor, however, and with some humour, corrects the all too common assumption that any of these weapons so skilfully wielded by the Nazis is new.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

They are perennial weapons of war, he reminds us. Joshua brought down the walls of Jericho by a "war of nerves," and the wooden horse of the Greeks was part of their Fifth Column against Troy.

Mr. Fodor makes it perfectly clear that terror is a very useful weapon of this war, and raises the question whether many of us have not done Hitler an unconscious service by describing in detail his use of frightfulness, thereby adding perhaps to the numbers of the frightened. It turns out that in France Hitler's agents were themselves spreading "atrocities" stories. They were able to set moving whole populations, to block the roads and create chaos, by the mere cry that the Huns were coming. Furthermore, the Nazis shrewdly added nerve-racking noise to the fear of death, by equipping their bombers with sound devices that sounded like all the witches of Endor let loose. They did so, probably, in the consciousness that the Maginot Line was built, among other things, to secure a sound-proof fortress, because in the last war more men went mad from noise in Verdun than were killed by wounds.

Mr. Fodor throws additional light on Fifth Column activities by inquiring how Fifth Columnists come to exist. He finds that in all countries there are "natural" Fifth Columnists. Among these "natural" and unconscious aids of Hitler, he ranks very high the believers in neutrality, whom the Nazis have exploited for all they are worth, thereby creating a situation where he never needed to attack more than one enemy at the same time. The cynicism with which the Third Reich has used abroad the very groups whom Hitler most ruthlessly persecuted at home—the Social Democrats and the Pacifists—is clearly described by the author. Mr. Fodor's most perfect illustration is the

## INTRODUCTION

case of Baron von Hahn, who did the Nazis' work in Holland, managing to superintend the arming of seditious local and imported groups, while he piously cultivated the Oxford Movement at the same time.

From his experience all over Europe, Mr. Fodor concludes that the most important direct Fifth Column work is done through actual legation and embassy staffs, and through tourists and business men.

But this percipient journalist believes that the most important explanation of the collapse of the democracies lies not in Hitler nor in Naziism nor in German efficiency, but in the fact of the latent revolution in every democratic State, which Hitler is skilful in exploiting. The overwhelming impression that I received in the nine weeks I spent in Europe last spring confirmed the truth of this analysis. The failure of the morale of France arose, in my own observation, from the fact that the French did not know for what they were fighting. An American friend who drove an ambulance at the front in the few weeks of the battle of France reported to me this summer that nearly every common *poilu* whom she met said: "This is not our war. Our war was lost in Spain"; or, "Our war was lost at Munich." "Our" war, quite evidently, was lost with the loss of the Russian alliance, and with the defeat of the working class in Spain, through the connivance of the Governments of France and Britain themselves. French soldiers, disillusioned with their own Governments, disillusioned with bureaucratic trade union leadership, had to meet an army animated by a fervid spirit, and convinced that they were fighting for the future.

Whatever the war in Europe has or has not proved, it has demonstrated the complete bankruptcy of the ruling

classes of Europe. They have proved bankrupt of patriotism, bankrupt of idealism, bankrupt of energy, and bankrupt of leadership. By the ruling classes I mean the middle-class elements, led by their own politicians and influenced by their industrialists and financiers, and the trade union bureaucrats whose standards were exactly copied from the class above them.

Hitler cannot be stopped by men who are still thinking in terms of the nineteenth century—of economic *laissez-faire*, of bourgeois comfort as the epitome of civilization, of money profit as the measure of value, and who praise an individualism which puts personal advantage over any other consideration whatsoever. This type of mentality brought France to ruin and brought Great Britain to catastrophe. Great Britain has pulled herself together to the extent that she has eliminated the people and the mentality that got her to the very brink of oblivion. The British began to behave like heroes when they were at last led by a soldier-artist, a man saturated with the greatest British tradition, who has lived all his life outside of the atmosphere of buying and selling and driving clever bargains—Winston Churchill—and who stretched his hand across the middle class to grasp that of labour.

In criticism of Mr. Fodor's book—a kindly criticism—I would suggest that he gives the Nazis too much credit as a revolutionary force and presents the Allied cause as pre-eminently a counter-revolution. I doubt whether that is really what he means to do, but that is the impression I have. Actually, the Nazi leaders are exploiters of a revolutionary situation. Hitler has no concept of a real world revolution, nor has Mussolini. Fascism is not revolution; it is, itself, counter-revolution masking as progress. Behind



## INTRODUCTION

Hitler is nothing but old-fashioned pan-Germanism, and a brutal desire to overthrow the existing plutocratic interests of the world and replace them by a Germanic monopoly State capitalism, with the power still wielded by the same classes who held it before, with the addition of the new upper class of party functionaries. Hitler's revolution is the revolution made by the elder Rockefeller when he wiped out the small oil concerns and made the first great merger, and Hitler's allies in all countries are the men who think in terms of international monopoly capitalism. True, there are other forces in Germany which the Nazi rising has released, and they may prove in the long run to be supremely powerful. And Hitler may ally himself with them, since he is before anything else an opportunist.

A real revolutionary force in opposing countries could knock down the Nazi monster. But the revolutionay force which will do so is not yet born. It is moving in the womb of democracy and creating a vast discomfort. Perhaps the war will bring it to birth. When the democracies at long last win the struggle, then it must come to birth. For the democratic world cannot be rebuilt along the lines of the nineteenth century.

At any rate, the weakness of the democracies lies in leadership by worn-out men and worn-out classes, who sought "peace in our time" unable to envision a great future; who no longer have conviction about the myths that nevertheless govern their lives and actions, and who will not yield place to younger, newer minds.

The weakness of the democracies lies in the fact that they are incapable of envisioning a more reasonable, civilized, just, and beautiful universe, and unwilling to assume the responsibility for creating it. The Maginot Line

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

is not only physical; it is mental and spiritual. We of the democracies wish only to defend what we have, not to re-create ourselves and the world. We are therefore neither revolutionary nor counter-revolutionary; we are merely static. And it is true that a moving body opposed to a static body of the same weight will overtopple it. The Nazis are not revolutionary but they are dynamic, and dynamic gangsterism is more powerful than static law enforcement.

Yet there exists in the human mind and soul, from one end of this groaning earth to the other, a yearning not yet made adequately articulate in organization and action for the coming revolution of the twentieth century—the revolution, perhaps, of which Victor Hugo dreamed: the revolution for civilization and humanity. Certainly that revolution was heralded in Russia, and certainly the Russian revolution is not yet finished. It is ridiculous to think, however, that the pattern of future civilization will be set by a vast sprawling country only just emerging from feudalism and illiteracy. The pattern for the civilization of the rest of this century and for the next one ought, in the nature of things, to be designed in the great democracies, who have all the tradition and background from which to take the decisive step forward. Certainly it should be we, the peoples of the British Commonwealth, the people of North America, this nation of nations and race of races, together with the progressive North Atlantic States, who sound the call for world liberation—for world co-operation, for the just and intelligent organization of men and resources to the end of creating a world where men and women can rise to a higher level of humanity. But without inner regeneration, regeneration of the individual and the community, we can no longer even defend what we have.

## INTRODUCTION

Without the sense of pushing forward to a grandiose goal we shall not even be able adequately to manufacture weapons with which to defend ourselves. We have reached a stage in history when we must go forward or perish. We cannot possibly hope to stay where we are.

The leaders of France hoped to stay where they were and keep France where she was. They have been destroyed and so has France.

He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

*September 7, 1940*



## Contents

CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction	7
1 I Saw the "Blitzkrieg"	17
2 Treason on the Meuse	30
3 Retreat from Flanders	38
4 The Refugees—Consequence of a "Débâcle"	46
5 The Unnerving Period of the "War of Nerves"	58
6 Germany's Secret Weapon: The Fifth Column	70
7 Why Collapse?	82
8 What is the Meaning of the Collapse?	98
9 Origins of the Revolution	105
10 The Isms Interconnected	115
11 Rapprochement Between the Revolutions	121
12 Causes and Aims of Revolutions	133
13 The Socialist Side of the Revolution	146
14 The Nationalist Side of the Revolution in Italy and Russia	162
15 The Nationalist Side of the German Revolution	177

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

CHAPTER	PAGE
16 When "Gangsters" Co-operate	189
17 The Revolution and the New World	202
18 Religion and the Revolution	213
19 The Revolution Marches On	221
Postscript	230

## Chapter 1

### I SAW THE "BLITZKRIEG"

"THAT's a strange sound," I thought, waking up suddenly in Brussels, early on the morning of May 10, 1940. It sounded as if extremely heavy stones had fallen on the pavement.

Still half asleep, I muttered to myself, "Why, we are being bombed!"

Indeed we were. I was in the Belgian capital because everybody thought an invasion of the Lowlands was imminent, and I had always expected that some day I should be abruptly awakened in this way; and yet I was flabbergasted when the real thing came. I went to the balcony of my hotel room. One hundred or more German bombers were circling over the city, unloading their unholy cargo.

Dawn was just breaking, and the chrome-grey clouds were taking on a narrow silvery brim, caressed by hidden rays of the sun. The darker grey of the heavy Heinkel bombers, however, stood out clearly against the clouds. Scores of small Belgian aeroplanes, carrying lights, looked like fireflies daring to attack bats. The Belgian pursuit planes seemed to circle round the German planes, but their machine-gun fire, clearly audible on the balcony despite the heavier noise of explosions and the somewhat weaker boom-booms of the anti-aircraft shells, was apparently inaccurate, because the Heinkels continued their bombing

undisturbed. The infernal concert of the noise of metal aeroplane propellers, of dropping and exploding bombs, the shrill whistle of the anti-aircraft guns, the nerve-shaking alarm of the air-raid sirens, went on for an hour and a half. Then deadly silence followed. Fifteen minutes after the bombardment life seemed to regain its usual forms. There came the milkman's cart, the butcher's pony, the postman's motor vehicle, the delivery automobiles, and clerks, shopgirls, mannequins, barbers' assistants all hurried to resume or start their business.

Only we, a few privileged (or unprivileged?) persons, realized that the totalitarian war, with all its horrors and consequences, was on. Ever since the sirens had sounded on that fatal morning, German troops had been pouring across the Germano-Belgian frontier. They also were pouring into Holland and Luxembourg.

As soon as the first aerial bombardment was over (the Germans bombarded intermittently all day long), I went with a colleague to visit the American embassy. Only about a hundred yards from the embassy building, a bomb had hit a house; it went right through the four-story building, demolished the entire interior, and bent the front wall so that the middle stories stuck out in the air as if the house had grown an *embonpoint*. The pavement in front of the house was covered with debris and the infinitely small particles of glass which cause many of the most dangerous wounds during bombardments. (This is why lace curtains with small meshes stuck all over the glass are so important, offering the best protection to people inside.)

The ambassador, Mr. John C. Cudahy, was already on the balcony, though it was only 6 a.m. The force of the bombardment had thrown him against a wall, but he kept



## I SAW THE "BLITZKRIEG"

his sang-froid; his Belgian personnel were all horror-stricken. In fact, when I saw him before leaving Brussels almost all of them had run away.

"Come up and have a cup of coffee," he signalled to us cheerfully. This was easier said than done. The blue glass over the heavy oak door of the embassy was smashed by the force of the explosion near-by, and glass and debris were all over the entrance.

Later on we inspected the other damage. There were various fires in the suburbs, and towards the north thick black smoke from an oil refinery was rising to the skies. Then we drove in the direction of the Cinquantenaire archway and through the avenue leading to Tervuren. Round this district we saw about a dozen houses destroyed. The most pathetic case was a house right on the avenue in which two children were killed by this first bombardment.

Poor little Guy de Liderkerke, aged twelve, was curious to see what caused those strange sounds of boom-booms so early in the morning. He went to the balcony and the next minute a bomb ripped into the house he lived in. He was instantly killed; another child was fatally wounded, while others were injured. Guy's body was placed in the entrance passage, covered with an old rug. His family fled, deprived of all their earthly possessions by one single bomb.

I was told that little Guy's body would be taken under cover of the night to the neighbouring *lycée*, the school where he would have gone that morning if the fatal bomb had not finished his young life so abruptly. This morning, however, his body would serve to remind his mates not to be curious if German aeroplanes were over the city.

When the air-raid sirens sounded, children left their games and ran for shelter, at least into the doorways.

There were no air-raid shelters in Brussels, or almost none. Also the number of anti-aircraft guns was too small and the Belgian air force was too insignificant to make an impression on the invaders.

The air-raid sirens sounded almost hourly. Hardly had the long, sonorous but plaintive sound of the "all clear" signal died down when another staccato of the alarm would follow. And this lasted day and night. The longest and most serious bombardment was almost always carried through at dawn, starting at about 4.30 and lasting until 6 a.m. But there were always air raids during the night—one around midnight, the next about 2.30 a.m., and for the benefit of those who tried to make up for the nightly lack of sleep by a nap in the afternoon, special raids around 3 p.m. were provided. I found that sleeplessness was the most terrible part of these bombardments—otherwise I refused to be impressed.

Besides air raids, the Germans were doing thorough military work, of course. The bombardment of Brussels was coupled with a general attack on the entire frontier lines from the North Sea right down to the Saar; that is, against Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The brunt of this first *Blitz* attack was directed against two points: the undefended Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and the Maas-tricht appendix, where Holland and Belgium meet.

A violent attack was opened against the north-eastern Belgian front, with the use of many motorized and armoured divisions, with motor-cyclists, with heavy artillery, violent aerial bombardment, and also parachutists. In the very first hours of the attack the Germans scored important successes,

especially through the "negligence" or "treason" of Belgian companies. A bridge in the Dutch sector over the Meuse was not blown up, owing to Fifth Column activities, and another bridge, which carried the road and railway coming from Maastricht over the Albert Canal, was also not destroyed. Similarly, another bridge of the Albert Canal, twenty miles north-west, was "forgotten." The Belgian apologists argue that the officers whose duty it was to dynamite these bridges were killed by German bombs; but the soldiers who did not run away talked later of "treason."

The other tragic point of Belgium's defeat was the early surrender of the stronghold of Eben-Emael. This formidable fortress fell into the hands of the Germans in the early hours of May 10. Eben-Emael was the strongest fort system in the Liège district. According to the official Belgian version, Eben-Emael fell to its assailants so soon because the Germans concentrated formidable forces against it. The heavy artillery was pounding the individual forts and pillboxes ever since dawn; hundreds of tanks were launched against the outer pillboxes, while legions of parachutists descended from the air into the interior of the largest forts, and captured the concrete and steel works.

It must have been terrifying for the inexperienced Belgian soldiers to see hundreds of German soldiers descending on them. Yet other fortresses, less formidably equipped than Eben-Emael, resisted for many days, while this stronghold fell in a few hours. The common people of Brussels whispered of treason, and foreign military attachés talked among themselves about the bribing of a high Belgian officer in this fortress.

The fall of Eben-Emael and the subsequent push of the

German motorized troops into the breach thus created decided the fate of Belgium in the first day. Heavy German tanks were now rolling on the Belgian roads, motorcyclist troops advanced cross-country and established machine-gun nests far behind the Belgian lines, and all day long hundreds of aeroplanes were pounding the rest of the lines.

As the German military columns advanced into green Belgium, the German Fifth Column alarmed the population: "Flee! Escape! The Huns are coming!" And lo! there started an exodus such as the world had never witnessed before. By nightfall of the tenth burning houses, aeroplanes bringing destruction and doom, heavy tanks rolling on roads with infernal noise, made it evident to all of us that the *Blitzkrieg* was on. And I had the doubtful privilege of witnessing the very beginning of it from the balcony of my Brussels hotel.

The *Blitzkrieg* took us by surprise—but did it? And if so, why? We had had plenty of warning. Responsible French quarters had long known that the attack on France was certain to come, and that it would come across the Low Countries

"The Germans are bound to attack in the late spring or the early summer. I cannot imagine that they will wait until the French and the British have superiority in manpower and arms. Where will the battle be fought? In the traditional battlefield of Europe, in Flanders. I should not be surprised if the big battle of the war of 1939-40 were fought within a radius of forty or fifty miles from Waterloo, because the Germans are bound to attack through Belgium and Holland. It will be a war of movement, and in this kind

## I SAW THE "BLITZKRIEG"

of warfare the French have always been superior to the Teutons."

These words, which, with the exception of the last sentence, proved to be almost prophetic, were said to me in the first days of 1940 by M. de Vitrolles, the clever French minister in The Hague.

Why did France and the two Netherlands not attempt by all means in their power to forestall the German moves? The answer is a tragic story of lack of statesmanship in the Low Countries, of the refusal of King Leopold of Belgium and Queen Wilhelmina of Holland to conclude alliances with the Western Powers or to make suitable military arrangements between the respective general staffs. Other factors in the story were incompetence, inefficiency, treason, Fifth Column activity in the Low Countries as well as in France.

For at least two years, the Low Countries had realized that they were continuously exposed to the danger of a sudden German attack. Nevertheless, they refused to treat not only with each other, but also with the Western democracies, concerning political and military aid. Yet they must have realized that France and England were the countries who could offer help to them in case of a German invasion. Both Holland and Belgium endeavoured to complete their own military and naval defences as fast as possible. When in August, 1939, German invasion of Poland appeared imminent, the Dutch and Belgians assumed that, simultaneously with the attack on Poland, the Germans would throw their motorized divisions into their respective countries, purposing a push through to northern France.

As early as October, 1939, more than forty divisions of

the German army were concentrated opposite the Low Countries, and by the end of October the number of these divisions was doubled. Moreover, twelve out of the seventeen German motorized divisions now were brought opposite Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg. So tense was the situation at the beginning of November, 1939, that King Leopold, tipped off by German emissaries and by a German lady friend, rushed to The Hague to see Wilhelmina and tried to counteract the danger of an imminent invasion by a joint peace offer of the two sovereigns.

At the end of October and the beginning of November, 1939, I made repeated trips into Holland to see the Dutch fortifications and inundation works, also to observe changes in the disposition of German troops on the Dutch-German border. Politically everything seemed to point in the direction of an immediate German attack on Holland, and the confidential news percolating from Germany to The Hague seemed to confirm this belief. But my trips to the frontier taught me otherwise.

It is true that the number of German divisions had been largely increased, but most of them were opposite Belgium rather than Holland. The troops in north-western Germany might or might not be concentrated against Holland. Large cavalry groups were brought to Clèves, but the Germans were surely not going to make *Blitzkrieg* with cavalry. They were throwing pontoon bridges across the Rhine near the Dutch border, but this seemed to be more a manœuvre than preparation for a totalitarian attack. Moreover, the Germans were building a large number of aerodromes just opposite Holland; but military experts believed that they sought protection for these aerodromes just by the shadow of this neutral frontier. They were converting many schools

## I SAW THE "BLITZKRIEG"

and public buildings into hospitals, which also suggested that they considered the Dutch frontier districts as a safe harbour for wounded soldiers.

During one of these frontier tours I could also establish that the soldiers opposite Holland were mostly elderly classes, and I found even two regiments of Slovak troops—certainly not fit for offensive purposes.

On November 4 I met with a nasty automobile accident. My Dutch friend drove the car into two huge trees—one was not enough for him. The next few weeks I had to go around with a head completely bandaged, and my friends used to call me "the first casualty of the Dutch war!"

Later on I drove with Bob Casey, of the *Chicago Daily News*, to see the Grebbe line of the Dutch defences, and when we approached the town of Amersfoort we got into a hurricane, unusual in those parts of Europe. The wind was blowing at a terrific speed and the clouds seemed to have burst; in the torrential rain it was impossible to distinguish between highways and canals. A huge beech tree, about six feet in diameter, was uprooted by the wind just in front of us and fell across the highway. A motor-cyclist, who was unfortunate enough to pass by at that moment, was killed by the falling giant; we tried to offer help, but soldiers and army ambulance men were already attempting to resuscitate the victim.

The officer in charge told us: "We were all fortunate that it was not the next tree which was uprooted by the hurricane, because the next and six others trees were mined, and if the wind had upset any of them, all the mines were bound to blow up. Then all of us would have been killed."

Still with a bandaged head, I had to report on the meeting

of the rulers of Holland and Belgium in The Hague, on November 6, 1939. One day later I noticed suddenly that steel-helmeted police, armed with carbines and revolvers, were guarding the public buildings in The Hague and in other Dutch cities. Two days later Captain Stephens and Sigismond Payne-Best were kidnapped from Venlo, a place on the Dutch frontier. Again two days later German troop concentrations on the Dutch border caused fear that an invasion of Holland was imminent. The situation was tense, and The Hague and Amsterdam were in a panicky atmosphere.

I telegraphed then to my paper, the *Chicago Daily News*:

"The Germans, as they did in Austria and Czechoslovakia, wanted to work by means of internal pressure as well, and a Dutch Nazi *Putsch* was engineered. This *Putsch* aimed at eliminating the present Government and replacing it with a Dutch Nazi Government that would have concluded a treaty with Germany. Since last Wednesday, however, public offices have been under guard by the Queen's auxiliary police, with steel helmets and bayonets.

"The nervousness was increased by the presence of the German army across the frontier. . . . German troops on the frontier are described as a special manoeuvre army trying out certain theories which, under peculiar conditions, could be best carried out under the protection of a neutral frontier. All this points to a temporary, if not a long, respite. . . . Germany will try to persuade Belgium and Holland to cede certain points and aerodromes peacefully. If this does not work, then force of arms may be used."

Repeatedly German feints were made on the Dutch and Belgian borders to find out the possible counter-moves in case of a *Blitz* attack, and also what the British and French



would do. As far back as November, 1939, the Germans knew how fast the Dutch could flood their inundation defences and where these defences were, and how quickly the first lines of the Dutch defences could be manned in case of a lightning attack. All this was needed to calculate the *Blitz* moves of their own army in order to anticipate by hours, or at least by minutes, the counter-moves of the enemy.

Before deciding on the final attack the Germans made several more rehearsal and feinting moves, or tried to divert attention from certain parts of their own defences to other, less relevant parts. For this purpose, they staged a clever "incident."

A German aeroplane with two majors of the general staff made a forced landing in Belgium, not far from the German border, on January 10, 1940. The landing was allegedly due to lack of petrol. One major had in his possession the plans of a complete German scheme of attack against Belgium which was to take place three days later. The two majors made apparently desperate attempts to destroy the documents, but failed; the plans showed that the Germans contemplated an attack on Belgium, and intended to pierce the Belgian fortification lines on the Meuse between Huy and Andennes. The conversation of one of the majors with the German air attaché was listened into by microphone, and the officer acted as if surprised; he swore even that he had destroyed the documents. This was all comedy! I immediately asserted that the plans were "phony," and were intended to divert attention from real plans. But this theatrical *coup* was staged so realistically that the Belgians were convinced and started to fortify the "threatened" section with great zeal, thus paying too little attention

to the lines to the right and left—where four months later the real attack was launched.

Minor *alertes* were then staged in April against Luxembourg and Holland, but they were just feints to divert attention from the coming German campaign in Norway. Hardly had the excitement caused by Norway's invasion died down when rumours of impending attacks on the Low Countries began to circulate. Obviously the new German troop movements on the Dutch and Belgian borders were intended to intimidate the Low Countries. There were eighty German divisions massed on this frontier section, including fourteen of the seventeen motorized divisions. Around May 6 there was evidence that the German attack would be launched against the Low Countries within the next few days. The Dutch were more nervous than the Belgians, because the Fifth Column worked better in Brussels and persuaded the *entourage* of the King that there was no danger. Nevertheless, all leaves in the Belgian and Dutch armies were suspended.

May 9 brought a slight alleviation. Thanks to the persuasive assurances of the Fifth Column sirens, Belgian military circles thought that the attack had been postponed for at least some days. This belief was also encouraged by certain German troop movements. Motorized divisions which formerly were posted opposite northern Belgium were suddenly withdrawn from the frontier. Encouraged by spies in the service of Germany, people believed that these columns had been completely removed. But, alas, experience taught us otherwise. They were withdrawn from the north, only to reappear the next morning opposite Luxembourg. Yet the withdrawal of the motorized divisions from those parts opposite northern Belgium caused such confidence in

## I SAW THE "BLITZKRIEG"

the Fifth Column-inspired part of the Belgian military leadership that leaves in the Belgian army were restored. The Dutch did not cease their vigilance. For three days prior to the outbreak of the totalitarian war Dutch patrols remained all night in their ultimate frontier positions.

Then came the dawn of May 10, and the appearance of the German aeroplanes over the Belgian capital.

## Chapter 2

### TREASON ON THE MEUSE

As the Marne was the famous river of the last World War, the Meuse is the tragic river of this war. Yet it was, and is, such a nice quiet river! Ever since the days of Jan van Eyck, its blue waters and green banks have been favourite subjects for Flemish and Belgian painters. Nevertheless, on the Meuse was decided the fate of Belgium and Holland, and the fate of France.

In the second half of April, 1940, accompanied by officers of the Belgian army and general staff, I visited the defences of Belgium, both on the Albert Canal and on the Meuse. I was taken around the fortifications of Namur. On the highest hill the Belgians were busy completing one of the strongest of these forts, while in other parts soldiers were erecting more pillboxes, barbed-wire fences, and other entanglements and obstacles. Huge anti-tank barriers ran around the city and its fortifications, and the steep cliffs, dropping almost perpendicularly into the blue river, seemed an insurmountable obstacle for enemy divisions.

From the parapet of the old citadel on the top of a hill, Namur seemed idyllically peaceful. One of the officers, however, pointed to a villa on the riverside:

"Do you see the small garden pavilion added to that villa over there? It is new. It looks like part of the villa, but it is prepared to spread fire and destruction from its concealed anti-tank guns if the enemy dares to assail

it. For this nice little garden house is one of our newest forts."

Less than a month later I saw Namur again. A large-scale German aerial bombardment had just reduced the peaceful homes and lovely gardens to smouldering ruins. It is true that Namur was a fortress town; yet it was also a city inhabited by peaceful people like you and me; people who never offended the Germans or anybody else. And today they are dead or in exile; their properties are reduced to debris and ashes.

As sudden as the destruction of Namur was the demoralization of the Belgian army. When I visited the eastern suburbs of Brussels on the morning of May 11, the second day of the totalitarian war, I found them, to my great amazement, crowded with soldiers in full war equipment, loafing in the public thoroughfares, surrounded by large, curious crowds. These fugitive soldiers were spreading the tale of defeat, nay, more, of a catastrophe; and by exaggerating the magnitude of the defeat, they helped to create further uneasiness, bordering on panic, amongst the Brussels population, who were already terrified by the constant bombardment by German planes, claiming large numbers of civilian victims.

"What are the officers doing?" I asked a sergeant who was the loudest in a crowd.

"They were the first to run away," was the laconic answer.

Where was the proud Belgian army which only a few days ago had seemed cheerful and confident? These ragged, destitute-looking soldiers recalled to me Ernest Hemingway's brilliant description of the Italian *débâcle* at Caporetto, in *Farewell to Arms*. This was obviously

another Caporetto, the consequences of which, however, proved to be more far-reaching than those of its Italian model. . . .

A half-hearted attempt was made by the Belgian authorities to collect these demoralized troops on the Cinquantenaire exhibition grounds and to re-form them into fighting units. The demoralization of the Belgian army, however, had proceeded so far that all these attempts seemed in vain. At the exhibition grounds the soldiers cursed their officers and refused to go back to the inferno on the Meuse and the Albert Canal. When the officers appealed to their patriotism, they answered that they preferred servitude to sure death. Nobody thought in terms of the future; there were no soldiers who realized that the fate of civilization might depend on the power of resistance of the Allies in Belgium.

Why were the soldiers back? The treason on the Lower Meuse and the Albert Canal which I have already described opened a breach in the Belgian lines, through which the German motorized columns were now pouring in. On the rest of the line anything between a thousand and two thousand German planes (according to the evidence of Belgian officers) were unloading their bombs over the Belgian army. The nerves of the Belgians gave way in the face of these heavy explosions, and by noon on May 10 three divisions were in retreat and later in complete dissolution.

Belgian officers with experience in the former World War told me that the aerial bombardment was probably less efficacious than the artillery barrage of the earlier war, yet German propaganda was always describing the devastating nature of aerial bombardments in such vivid terms that it created in all countries opposed to Germany a psychosis

which was thus responsible for the *débâcle* of the Belgian army.

While the Belgian forces on the Albert Canal and the Lower Meuse were in complete dissolution, the Germans did not forget to deal with the southern part of the Belgian front. The Belgian army was expecting a direct attack coming through the Ardennes, a hilly, rough country, with thick woods and winding rivers. The undulating hills there were believed to be extremely suitable for defence—the Belgian general staff thought that the army could hold the fortifications and pillboxes of the Ardennes for at least five days, while neutral observers calculated that at least two days would be required for the Germans to reach the Upper Meuse between Givet and Liège.

At the beginning of their "lightning war" the Germans did not concentrate their attack on the Ardennes fortifications. They once more resorted to their well-known tactics of turning the enemy's line. Thus they rushed their troops into undefended Luxembourg, which had an army of one hundred and fifty-six men, and which had previously been pumped full of Fifth Columnists in the form of tourists. Everybody in Brussels believed that the French could launch their divisions into Luxembourg as quickly as the Germans. Yet the Germans were able to occupy the Grand Duchy within a few hours without meeting any serious resistance, except in the extreme southern part. Luxembourg once occupied, they could rush their divisions into south-eastern Belgium. With the aid of their artillery they mowed down the barbed-wire entanglements and other obstacles, and hundreds of German motor-cyclists with machine-guns in their side-cars rushed cross-country into Belgium, leaving forts and pillboxes behind to be dealt with by heavy tanks

and artillery. The Ardennes sector thus was occupied within forty-eight hours, which, in turn, enabled the German troops to proceed with the attack on the upper reaches of the Meuse.

It was calculated by the Belgian and French general staffs that the French army could take over the Belgian section of the Meuse between Namur and Givet within forty-eight hours. And here happened the other tragedy of the present war, another drama on the Meuse River: the folding up of the French Ninth Army.

Vigilance and preparedness of the commanding officers is one of the elementary requirements of a war. An Austrian friend of mine used to say that the defeat of the Austrians by the Russians in the Carpathians was due to the fact that the Austrian officers liked to drink and enjoy themselves until the small hours of the morning, and that the "inconsiderate" Russians would attack shortly after these drunken officers went to bed. . . .

Napoleon used to inspect his troops personally during the night, taking good care that no omission in vigilance should be permitted. The leaders of the French Ninth Army had forgotten their great predecessor's maxims. There was no vigilance among its chiefs. Was it negligence? Or was it more? In any case, we had all been expecting a German attack on the Belgian-French lines ever since May 6, and yet General Corap, commander of the Ninth Army, was absent when the Germans launched their motorized divisions against the Allied lines, and did not turn up for another twenty-four hours. He had been given orders to take over the Belgian front between Namur and Givet, on the Meuse, and also to defend the positions of the extended Maginot Line, from Givet to Sedan, along the



## TREASON ON THE MEUSE

Meuse. On May 12, when the French troops should already have been in position along the Meuse, only a fraction of the Ninth Army arrived to take over the Belgian positions. Six bridges on the Meuse were not blown up; their dynamite chambers were left untouched. Over these intact bridges, meeting only slight resistance, poured the German motorized and armoured troops.

A river like the Meuse is still an important obstacle to tanks. Regular solid bridges are needed to support German heavy tanks, which weigh forty or fifty tons; no quickly constructed pontoon bridge can bear the weight of these steel giants. Moreover, guns placed on the other side of a river can hold off advancing tanks for a long time. Granted that there was a surprise element in the German attack, still there is no excuse for six bridges being left intact; for the artillery remaining unused; for troops being one hundred hours behind schedule; for the air force failing to appear in time and in sufficient numbers.

Is it to be wondered that the word "treason" was now whispered amongst the *poilus*, in the cafés of Sedan, in the restaurants of Lille? And it *was* treason. Even if the entire staff of General Corap can whitewash themselves from the charge of actual treason, their action, for all practical purpose, was treason to their country. They failed to carry through a minutely drafted defence plan of the French general staff. They failed to organize their units properly; they failed to observe that vigilance which is the first commandment of all army officers.

It will be difficult to erase the belief, firmly fixed amongst the French troops of the Ninth Army and whispered all over northern France, that treason, probably actual bribery of some officers, or of one staff officer (these were the

versions related at the time in those parts), was the cause of the *débâcle* on the Meuse.

With the bridges undynamited, only one defence remained: metal against metal, either in the form of anti-tank guns with proper armour-piercing shells, or the actual opposition of other tanks. But where were the French armoured divisions? Where were the French tanks, the French anti-tank guns? France had hardly any. Behind her Chinese Wall, the Maginot Line, she had felt secure. But this line defended only part of France's frontier; on the part undefended by the Maginot Line, the Germans resorted to a modernized form of medieval warfare: the metal-protected warrior. The knights of the Middle Ages rode against each other in armour of forged steel, and tried to dislodge each other from the saddle either by their heavy lances or the sheer weight of their impact; the Germans now substituted a steel-plated tank for the war horse, and replaced the lance with the guns and machine-guns of the tanks.

But the French had few armoured warriors of their own, not enough tanks to oppose the sheer weight of the on-rushing German metal. Valiantly the French infantry died before the devastating fire of the German tanks and low-flying aeroplanes. The few motorized units of the French army were quickly reduced to old junk—sometimes less than a hundred men of a motorized column survived the German assault. Heroically they tried to resume resistance but in vain. The unblown bridges did their duty. . . .

German armoured and motorized divisions poured into France on May 12 through the breach created by the failure of Corap—a breach by then fifty miles wide and fifty miles deep. Tanks, spreading fire and destruction,

supported by low-flying aeroplanes with which they were connected by radio, co-operated in advancing on French soil, while the bringing up of French reinforcements was impeded by the constant flow of refugees pouring towards Paris.

The German advance was fast. It no longer reflected the old tactics of advancing on a whole solid front—"Advance wherever you can," was the German motto. Thus, here German tanks rushed sixty and seventy miles ahead of other units; there motor-cyclists driving madly cross-country at sixty miles an hour advanced often a hundred miles in front of the bulk of the army. Thus everywhere breaches were created and a war of movement went on.

The Meuse River, blue when I saw it in April, was coloured red at spots by blood. The German inventiveness and ingenuity were incredible. At other spots where bridges had been dynamited German audacity tried impossibly difficult methods of fording the river. Thus, at one shallower section motor trucks were driven into the river in great numbers, and these sunken trucks then served as a sufficiently solid basis for fording by tanks.

At other places the sluices of the Meuse remained undamaged. German motor-cyclists speeded across the river on the top planks of these sluices, hardly thirty inches in width, and dashed into Belgian or French lands deep behind the lines, where they established machine-gun nests.

But although the Germans fought with courage and were more inventive and faster than the French, I cannot help repeating: The German success in northern France was chiefly the result of "the treason on the Meuse."

## Chapter 3

### RETREAT FROM FLANDERS

THE Sunday before the totalitarian war began I went with a friend of mine, Frazier (Spike) Hunt, of the Hearst services, to Waterloo. We wanted to reconstruct the great battle in our imagination—on the spot. From the top of the famous Lion Hill, a monument erected in memory of the victory, one could see all the farms where Napoleon's or Wellington's forces had had their *points d'appui*.

Then we visited the cinema where a fifteen-minute film made in Hollywood almost a decade before, was being shown. In this picture Napoleon was repeatedly inquiring in the heat of the battle:

"Where is Grouchy?"

He had sent his general Grouchy to pursue the retreating Prussians, but he now missed him. And the film tried to convey the impression that Grouchy's failure to show up during the battle was the cause of the Emperor's defeat.

It may have been so and it may not. But for the next days certainly I awoke during the nights and I heard as in a vision: "Where is Grouchy?"

When one week later the *débâcle* on the Meuse occurred, I was still saying to myself, subconsciously: "Where is Grouchy?"

Where was the general who could come to fill up the badly shaken front on the Meuse? Where was the help which Napoleon and Maxime Weygand awaited in vain?

## RETREAT FROM FLANDERS

Here we were only a few miles away from Waterloo, and as the French Minister in The Hague had predicted to me five months earlier, the big battle of the 1940 war was developing somewhere within fifty miles from Waterloo. Oh, great Napoleon, oh, small epigoni! Woe to a nation which creates an idol like the "Little Corporal," and then cannot live up to that reputation one hundred and thirty-five years later. . . .

Yes, there was no Napoleon to draw the plan nor a Grouchy to come to help. And yet I still maintain that on May 13 the situation was by no means completely hopeless. I still maintain that the breach made by the Germans between Dinant and Sedan on the Meuse could have been filled up, as the gaps at Verdun and the breach at Neuve-Chapelle were closed in the war of 1914-18. This breach could have been filled if there had been a steady front on the Franco-Belgian border. But this front was in movement because a large number of British troops were still pouring into Flanders and eastern Belgium, not realizing that their right flank was in extreme danger, owing to the breakthrough at Sedan.

Since May 12 British troops had been fighting on the Louvain-Namur defence line. If we drove east in our car we could clearly hear the booming of the heavy German guns. On certain roads then we could see the British troops arriving to take over positions on the Louvain-Namur line. Belgian police, aided by British military police, controlled us when we tried to drive out towards the front, yet we always managed to evade the vigilance of the authorities. If we saw a Tommy near a Belgian policeman we always stopped at the British soldier, and, talking English, we could easily persuade him to let us see the incoming troops.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

I admired those British boys. We found them on all roads leading from west to east, wearing their battle dress, which was a one-piece suit of khaki colour, with plenty of pockets on the top part. All the Tommies wore steel helmets. Boys, who only three or four months before did not even know of the existence of Belgium, were now directing traffic very efficiently on the roads.

"Hullo, Jack," my companion addressed the British boys. "How do you like it here?"

They generally grumbled about the food, but were happy when we gave them English cigarettes.

And then we saw endless chains of British troops coming into Belgium and departing towards the Louvain-Namur line. Here were the Welsh Guards—some of them I had seen in Gibraltar a year before—the Sherwood Foresters, the Royal Fusiliers, and other British infantry units—all motorized. They were driving on motor trucks, beautifully made trucks, wearing brownish-yellow camouflage colours and patterns, on small tanks, fitted out with radio, on artillery drawn by tractors, and in innumerable army service wagons. It was a never-ending, orderly procession—Britain poured her help into Belgium.

Howard Brubaker, in a 1940 spring issue of *The New Yorker*, wrote that if Germany attacked Belgium and Holland, the Allies would promise their help nobly and gallantly but that this help was sure to be two weeks late. Brubaker was witty but wrong. The British came as quick as could be. But what a mistake it was for them to walk into this trap! We in Brussels knew that it was a trap, but apparently the British general staff did not realize it. Once the plan was made, they apparently could not change it.

Already on May 12 the Germans repeated their tactics of

May 10 and sent incredibly large numbers of aeroplanes to bombard the joint Belgian-British positions on the Antwerp-Louvain-Namur line. While the bombardment was done by inexperienced flyers on bad machines—some of these German mass bombardments were carried through with flyers who had been trained only four to eight weeks and with cheap and badly built planes; nothing more was required from them than to be able to fly in mass formations and to release bombs high over the enemy lines—Louvain and Namur, the two fortress towns, were bombed by expert flyers and were reduced within a short time to smouldering ruins. Their total destruction and the partial annihilation of Antwerp deprived the British of important pivot points. When the British troop reinforcements arrived in these cities, they found no billets, no depots, no storage places for their equipment and ammunition, and this made the defence almost impossible.

One is amazed that under these circumstances the British continued to send more troops. It was amazing enough that they sent troops in at all. The complete *débâcle* of the Belgian army within the first hours of the totalitarian war must have been known to the British and French general staffs, who, after all, had observers in Brussels. Why did these observers not warn their respective staffs against sending reinforcements to a completely beaten Belgian army? Or, if such warning was sent, why was it not listened to? Why did the two general staffs send their armies into positions which already on May 12 were known to be traps? When the British heard that there was a second Caporetto on the Albert Canal and a break-through at the Meuse, they should have stopped sending further reinforcements into Belgium, despite all pleas from King Leopold.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

If the British had remained on the extended Maginot Line, that is, from Dunkerque to Givet, where military critics believe that they could have resisted the German attack for several weeks, then the Germans would probably have exhausted their petrol and oil supplies and their victory could have been turned into a disaster. I believe that resistance could have been successful on this extended Maginot Line, despite the gap at Sedan. Then this gap probably could have been closed. . . . As it was, on May 15 the French gave up Namur; on May 16 the British fell back on Brussels.

The days between the beginning of the totalitarian war and that of the British retreat from Brussels were difficult and anxious. Brussels first became fuller and fuller—because there were more retreating Belgian troops and an ever-increasing number of refugees—and then it became emptier and emptier. There was a complete blackout at night-time, and the nightly information walks were dangerous because it was easy to be “mistaken” for a parachutist. The parachutist danger dominated public interest. I saw some parachutists in the countryside who could easily be disposed of, since the parachutist descends slowly and a half-way good shot can deal with him. But I did not see any parachutists in Brussels; yet all talk in the cafés and in the streets was about these “strange emissaries from higher regions.”

Yes, there was a regular scare. The “parachutist danger” was one of these clever tricks of the German war-lords and propaganda masters, to excite the imagination of their adversaries. Practically every half-hour, wherever we went, one heard the sudden cry:

“Parachutists, parachutists!”



## RETREAT FROM FLANDERS

Now a woman (the spotters were almost always women) saw one descending in the air; then another saw a man creeping on the housetops—he was bound to be a parachutist! Every time the police, armed with rifles, or the soldiers entrusted to deal with Fifth Column danger were then obliged to surround and search one or several house blocks. It is needless to say that in each case the parachutist was either a swallow flying high, or else a creation of the imagination of a highly strung woman, or the cry of a Fifth Columnist to keep the police occupied and so prevent them from rounding up dangerous Fifth Columnists.

In vain did the Belgian Government publish communiqués stating that no parachutists had been sighted or captured in the Brussels region for the last forty-eight hours; the parachutist scare continued. Repeatedly the police ordered us to stop, and then, mounting on the running-board of our hired automobile, commanded us to pursue a parachutist who was said to have escaped in a taxi.

Even allowing for the combination of propaganda and imagination, it is strange that parachutists should have become such a scare. After all, as I have said, they can be easily dealt with, except at night, and even then only a few can land in woods or forests to creep secretly to some railroad junction or army depot to blow it up. Yet in every country there were enough resident Fifth Columnists to do such kind of work. Why, then, risk the highly dangerous descent by parachute?

Brussels by now was empty. The sound of heavy German guns was audible all the time in the city, and the population was rapidly leaving the endangered town. In the Hôtel Métropole the foreign correspondents were

almost the only guests left. In a big restaurant the manager approached us and said:

"I have lots of caviare here in my inn. Would you not like to eat it? I will charge very low price for it. I would rather give it to you than let it fall into German hands."

The aerial bombardments of Brussels were now somewhat more sporadic, but the sounds of the heavy guns came ominously near. We found out on the Louvain road that the Germans were already close to Brussels. As we drove, we saw huge holes in the road made by eight-inch shells. Already May 15 proved ominous.

In the Foreign Office, and in the Prime Minister's office, they gave us optimistic talks, but we saw on the sad and frightened faces that all was lost. We knew that the Government was preparing to withdraw to the seashore, and we inquired hourly whether a new decision to this effect had been reached. We knew that the French had abandoned Namur on May 15. The French Seventh Army, operating in the Zeeland parts of Holland, was obliged to withdraw to Antwerp, and its gallant and able commander, General Giraud, was captured by the Germans.

When the British troops were forced to retreat on Brussels, all the foreign correspondents left the city. On May 17 the British troops were obliged to fall back on the Dender River, beyond Brussels. One day later they were forced back on the Schelde River, after offering heroic resistance. The British boys, most of them insufficiently trained and belonging to territorial formations, fought like lions, and only in the face of heavy odds and concentrated mechanical attacks of the Germans did they withdraw on May 20 to the Lys River, where another British army had

## RETREAT FROM FLANDERS

offered heroic resistance to the Germans—twenty-two years ago. . . .

All this heroism was in vain, because the French were unable to close the gap at Sedan and the Germans were now driving to Abbéville, and later to Boulogne and Calais. I will not repeat the story of the resistance at Dunkerque and the evacuation of the British forces.

I was sorry for those fine boys. They had no idea that they were going into a trap. I saw them going in and coming out. They drove their motor trucks and tanks cheerfully and when I met them, they always made the "thumbs up" sign. They were singing popular songs, though I never heard any outstanding favourite which could have been called "the" war song of 1940. *Roll out the Barrel* and songs of Gracie Fields were only weak attempts to find a *Tipperary*.

Probably nothing characterizes the spirit of the retreating British army better than the behaviour of a captain, a friend of mine.

He was in his full uniform of the Coldstream Guards, a heavy red coat and the bearskin headgear. Asked why he chose this gala uniform just now, he said:

"I was told to discard everything which I considered unnecessary on the retreat. I never liked my battle-dress. So I took on my full uniform for the retreat and discarded my battle-dress. And you are asking me why I grow a beard? They told me to discard unnecessary things, so I threw away my razor."

## Chapter 4

### THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A "DÉBÂCLE"

*Vae victis!*—Woe to the vanquished! These words of Livy hold good today even more than of yore. It is difficult to say yet what price the Germans paid for their glory, but we know the price the defeated had to pay.

The first result of the *débâcle* was the millions of refugees, who drifted always farther and farther, first like a slow-moving tide, and later like a torrent. I saw the first of them filling the streets of Brussels on the morning of May 11, running away to escape German domination. The Belgians, after all, have once before tasted what German "freedom" means—from 1914 to 1918. There were old women with pets, children carrying luggage, other children crying bitterly, babies pushed in perambulators, often half-covered with lighter pieces of household goods. Some of the refugees could evacuate their places on motor trucks, others on farm wagons; again, others used bicycles. And some days later the first refugees arrived who had left their homes on foot and walked sixty and eighty miles to reach the capital.

I myself had to join this long chain of refugees when on May 16 we learned that the Government had left Brussels, and that the radio and the telegraph were no longer working because all the equipment had been dismantled and taken "somewhere" into western Belgium, whither the Government was retiring. It was, however, easier to decide to

## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A “DÉBACLE”

leave Brussels than actually to leave. First, travelling was by no means easy and it was most difficult to procure a vehicle. And, second, all kinds of papers were needed to keep the Belgian or British or French authorities from hindering one's retreat.

Spike Hunt and I decided to leave town. We wanted to get a French visa, but the French consulate had already scooted off some days before to an “unknown” destination. So we had to risk leaving without a French visa mark. On the other hand, to be able to quit Brussels by car we needed a *permis à circuler* from the Belgian army authorities. When we obtained this permission, we asked the Foreign Office in Brussels (which, by the way, had already shifted to Ostend, leaving only a few members of the staff behind) to give us a safe-conduct. Equipped with these documents we now went in quest of an automobile. Days before the approaching end, taxis had been obtainable only with extreme difficulty, and at fantastic rates; most people had left the city in the first days of the *débâcle*.

But now that the end was so near, it was impossible to obtain any means of communication. My hotel was already empty; the younger porters, waiters, maids, etc., had disappeared, and the nice porter, who always used to procure cars for us even under the most difficult circumstances, had left.

The Secretary of the American Embassy told us that the American Consul intended to sell his car. We rushed to the Consulate and found out that in the meantime the Consul had changed his mind. One does not sell cars under circumstances such as existed in Brussels!

Fortunately, in the ante-room of the Consul we met the representative of a large American automobile firm who

told us that he knew a garage where a Chevrolet was for sale. We rushed to the garage and bought the car. We had no time to buy it—we took it because it was the last means of communication available. The owner asked four hundred dollars for it—it was a 1934 Chevrolet! I showed the owner two hundred dollars in cash—good American dollar notes. I explained that two hundred dollars in original notes was at present the equivalent of four hundred dollars in Belgian currency. He was clever, and yielded.

Now we had to bribe the garage personnel for various services. First, all petrol was under military supervision, but good dollar notes helped us to get enough petrol to fill not only our tank, but also a huge container stored in the back of the car. Moreover, the newly acquired automobile had no licence numbers. I told the garage man (pushing dollars into his hand) that we *must* have licence plates!

“But I have only two different ones,” he sighed.

“Put those on—they are better than nothing,” I said.

But later on I was sorry for this hurried remark. Repeatedly on the way Belgian police and British Tommies took the numbers of every car, apparently looking for suspected Fifth Columnists. If they had caught us with the two different licence plates, then probably we should have been arrested as suspects. But fortunately all Tommies or policemen who took the car numbers looked at only one number, and it never occurred to them to check both sides!

We called our newly-acquired automobile “Ferdinand the Bull,” because he lay down on us quite frequently. Ferdinand did not like war, disliked most intensely German aeroplanes flying over us, but behaved on the whole very nicely, and brought us after many vicissitudes to Paris, where he duly broke down.

## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A "DÉBÂCLE"

Before we started to pull out from Brussels we consulted the Belgian Foreign Office about the route to take; the result was that we started towards Ninove, a city twenty-five miles west of Brussels. We got into the chain of refugee automobiles and it took us five hours to make the twenty-five miles. Later on we had to invent all kinds of tricks to get ahead of the endless chain of refugee cars. Spike Hunt, in his deep baritone voice and in his suave way, would start to talk to the Tommies who were on military police service on the road.

"Jack, do you like your country?" he said.

After the affirmative answer he would continue:

"Then talk to your officer. We are American journalists and we have an important story to tell. If we tell all we have seen, America might come into the war."

This generally worked, though in reality Spike was a rigid isolationist. Occasionally we could speed for fifty miles or so ahead and visit parts which were of great interest to us.

Flanders was full of British soldiers, and at a château they were just establishing the headquarters of the British Expeditionary Force. The Tommies were of good cheer, and the spirit and morale were excellent, which was gratifying to see after the complete demoralization of the Belgians.

While we were driving along the road, there were frequent air-raid alarms. The Germans repeatedly flew over us, but it was hard to tell whether the attacks were meant for us, the refugees, or the British troops who were still pouring in on the other side. At Renaix, where there was a bad traffic congestion, which held us up for hours, there were four air-raid alarms—while we were waiting on the road. Many people ran towards the shelters; others took it

philosophically and remained in their cars. Both left and right of the main road two large buildings were destroyed by aerial bombardment, but nothing happened on the road itself.

It was tragic to be compelled to visit all the old battlefields of 1914-18 during the last stage of our exit from Belgium. The German advance forced us to make various detours, and after being chased almost to the seashore we regained our way towards Ypres.

We spent our last night in Belgium on the floor of a small café in Ploegsteert (where the famous battle of "Plugstreet" in the last war was fought). The beds in the house were all rented for the night to refugees who had arrived earlier. Spike had to curl up on an old sofa and I in a wicker chair, which however I soon abandoned for the floor. The innkeeper and his very pretty wife, the mother and grandmother, as well as the innkeeper's child—all five—slept on a big leather divan—naturally all in a sitting position. There was in consequence not much sleep, and at 4 a.m. the pretty hostess cooked coffee and some eggs for us. Then we departed with the intention of crossing into France. Though we arrived on the Franco-Belgian border at five in the morning, a mile and a half of automobiles were ahead of us, and the long snake of cars made but little headway. Most of us got out of our cars and chatted with one another.

It was a motley crowd, surpassing the fantasy of any poet or novelist. There were several rich diamond merchants from Antwerp, whose wives had diamonds larger than pullets' eggs. My neighbour, also from Antwerp, was a former captain of the Belgian Lancers, now out of action because his eyesight was poor. His wife had the largest and finest diamonds of all.



## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A "DÉBÂCLE"

The next day we crossed into France at Armentières. Where was the charming mademoiselle from Armentières now? She must be an old lady, and one of the refugees. Crossing the frontier was easy; automobiles, trucks, lorries, vans, and horse-drawn carriages passed the post one after the other. There were several hearses in the procession; finding no other means of conveyance, people were actually riding in these hearses, after putting some timber planks against the glass walls.

Many of the large factory trucks coming from eastern Belgium were carrying as many as forty to fifty people. The refugees as a rule placed plenty of straw on the trucks and tried to sleep pressed together like sardines in a tin box. The majority were old and middle-aged women, and children. The first day of their exile the children were gay. It was a kind of picnic for them. But people who had been five or six days on the road looked tired, and the children were bored and they cried. Many an old woman fainted in the heat, and then the whole caravan had to stop until some male went to find water. If a truck or an automobile broke down, this held up the whole refugee column because the other side of the road was occupied by the troops, tanks, and military trucks coming in.

The bicycle refugees made comparatively swift progress because on the edge of the road they could cut ahead of the line of automobiles. And even the pedestrian exiles often overtook them because the motor vehicles had to stop so frequently.

Most of the automobiles had mattresses over their tops. This served a double purpose. The mattress was a good protection against the machine-gun bullets of the German aeroplanes, while at night-time the car-owner could sleep

on it. The difficulty of these refugees was not so much food shortage as lack of accommodation for a night's rest. Many slept on the floors of schools, churches, public buildings, and as these buildings got full by the early evening hours, the rest had to seek an abode either in barns or in the open air. Fortunately for the refugees, the entire period of the totalitarian war in Belgium and northern France occurred in fine sunshiny weather.

Once we had entered France, we thought that our Odyssey had come to an end, but the real flight had just begun. By that time the advance of the German motorized columns through the gap made on the Meuse had become so swift and so far-reaching that we were being chased. After passing Lille, where we saw the frightful results of German aerial bombardment (hits were scored mostly on civilian objects and not military aims), we were pursued right to Abbéville! Later apparently the tide turned, for we were permitted to take the route to Beauvais, but before we reached this city we had to withdraw in the direction of Rouen, and passed through bridges already heavily protected by barbed-wire fences and other obstacles, to Paris.

While in Belgium there were only Belgian automobiles retreating, we now saw an even greater variety of cars. There were heavy motor lorries with escaping Belgian troops, large trucks from the north of France and from the Pas de Calais, also automobiles from the Somme district and from the Aisne. Naturally, this endless chain of refugees had seriously handicapped the movements of the French troops. Occasionally we were stopped to make way for heavy mechanized French columns proceeding eastward.

British soldiers were establishing aerodromes in many

## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A “DÉBÂCLE”

places in northern France near the sea, to abandon them finally only a few days later.

When I arrived in Paris, the Germans were already so near the French capital that we slept in our clothes, ready to leave as soon as our friends gave the signal. It was a morose and unhappy Paris. The streets were empty; most of the rich and better-class people apparently were already on their holidays, and the remainder were leaving or just about to leave. It was impossible to find a taxi, and the Métro (subway) was full to an extent which I never saw before. After an air raid it was unusable for hours because of the jam. Repeated air-raid warnings compelled us to spend hours indoors or in places of refuge. I always refused to go into air-raid shelters because I wanted to know what was going on, and if I went underground, I saw nothing.

I was sent from Paris to Tours, where the Government came some days later, and from Tours to Bordeaux—always with an endless trail of refugees. Bob Casey drove me to Tours, but from there I took the refugee train to Bordeaux. I was twelve hours in the train instead of the scheduled four hours, and when I arrived in Bordeaux the refugees filled every corner of the city. I was permitted to sleep in the lobby of the Terminus station hotel, and this helped me to obtain a room later in the same hotel. The room was small and hot, and overlooked the glass roof of the station. As Bordeaux was a special target of German aeroplanes, it is needless to say that I got but little rest in my roof room at that hotel.

The most imaginative mind cannot picture this influx of refugees into the south of France. The roads and the railroads were pouring them in from all over the country—not only from Belgium, Holland, and northern France, but

from Paris and at last from the Riviera and the Italian frontier. By the time I left, the number of refugees in this south-west corner of France, with a normal population of two million, amounted to eight millions! This is a conservative estimate, and the local authorities spoke of ten millions, of whom two and a half millions were Belgian and Dutch. There were many British and American people stranded in France, and they all congregated in the south. It was like refugees from a Chinese flood . . . without places to sleep, spending the nights and day in the open air, despondent and hopeless, these refugees presented a heart-breaking picture. And yet each hour brought new refugees. The "Gare des Evacués"—the Station of the Evacuated—was pouring out its human fodder hour after hour. There were beautiful Parisiennes wearing fur coats in the unbearable heat of the southern sun, and dresses made by Patou and Schiaparelli, and yet carrying two valises, containing the only things they could save from their Paris homes. Fur coats they always brought with them because they represented a saleable value—who knew how to live for the next weeks? Later they had to sell their bodies. . . .

One must not forget that even at the end of May the banks gave out only a limited amount of money per week—about one thousand francs; and to obtain that sum, the unfortunate French people had to wait for thirty-six and forty-eight hours. To obtain more, one had to wait for several days in a queue before the Banque de France. And then there were queues before foodshops! There was, however, plenty to eat—you only had to await your turn to get it. Those who had money could buy any amount of food; those who were penniless had to address themselves to the

## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A "DÉBÂCLE"

French Red Cross, which distributed food and drinks at the stations and at various vantage points.

Probably the fact that the frightened Frenchmen and Belgians passed through rich agricultural districts such as Belgian Flanders, French Pas de Calais, the Vendôme, and the Gironde explains why in the first half of June there was plenty of food for everybody. In the middle of June, when Paris was already occupied by German troops, the food situation was still extremely satisfactory in Bordeaux. At the famous restaurant of old Monsieur Dubern, on the Allée de Tourny, we still could get magnificent eight-course dinners for twenty-three francs—less than half a crown—consisting of a hors-d'œuvre, soup, fish, meat, vegetables, salad, cheese, and dessert, and for six francs—about eightpence—one could get a big bottle of the exquisite châteaux wine made by the Maison Dubern.

There was a shortage of sugar and beef, but even so there was enough sugar to sweeten one's coffee or put on one's dessert. And yet I saw a Belgian refugee growing very angry with the waiter when he was unable to obtain extra sugar for his delicious strawberries, served with whipped cream.

At the restaurant Chapon Fin one could find many French Cabinet ministers, senators, deputies, and ex-deputies, also many members of the actual Belgian Cabinet of those days. The Chapon Fin was somewhat higher in price than the rest, yet for seven and sixpence you could have an excellent meal with a good bottle of wine. There was plenty to eat, but if you did not turn up before noon for lunch or before seven for your dinner, you had to wait hours before you got a table in any of the restaurants.

And the refugees, forgetting all their troubles, were

eating as much as possible, probably thinking in their subconscious mind, "Let's eat it before the Germans do. . . ." It was only after the Germans occupied Bordeaux that food became scarce and the position of the refugees catastrophic.

The authorities tried in vain to regulate the refugee problem. Today they ordered the Belgians to quit Bordeaux, so that the French refugees could take their place; tomorrow the French had already to move on, because the hotels were requisitioned for the Government, which was to come to Bordeaux.

Whereas from one side of the big station came the continuous influx of refugees, the left wing was pouring out another product of the war: the wounded. The wounded *poilus* from the front were transported to these southern French cities, and the first station was Bordeaux. Day and night hospital trains arrived, and an endless chain of ambulance wagons were waiting before the Terminus station to take on the wounded and transport them to castles and public buildings converted into hospitals.

When the Germans approached Bordeaux and I had to continue my withdrawal, I took the train for Hendaye, on the Spanish frontier. The train was seventeen hours late, but I had to wait on the station platform because nobody knew when it was due to arrive. It was a "military secret." About four thousand refugees, half of whom were children, waited for the train. There were four air-raid alarms, and each time the lights went out completely. One could hear only the sobbing of children or the barking of a pet dog in exile, and then came the noise of the aeroplanes. One can imagine the suspense of these unfortunate people. The Bordeaux station was a chief target of the Germans, and the glass roof was certainly no protection. On the contrary.

## THE REFUGEES—CONSEQUENCE OF A “DÉBACLE”

Then came the train. There were about twelve of us in one compartment made for six. But the people were comparatively cheerful. A very good-looking mannequin from Paris said to her neighbour:

“My life’s dream has always been to go to Biarritz. But I was earning too little and I never could afford it. Now the Evacuation Committee has sent me to Biarritz.”

Such are the little whims and ironies of life. . . .

A fat man in the corner, who said that he was managing director of a big armament works in northern France, now occupied by the Germans, was also sent to Biarritz.

“For five years I could not afford to take holidays. Now I am compelled to take one. . . .”

Probably the saddest picture was presented by the ghost line of armament workers from northern France who were now evacuated to Bayonne. They brought with them only a small bag, a gas mask, and a steel helmet—all they could save. And yet their unwillingness to work longer hours, when the German armament workers were working twelve and sixteen hours per day, had caused France to have insufficient armaments to meet the German onslaught. It was a terrible vengeance of Fate.

The tragedy of these refugees was more overwhelming and catastrophic than any former mass emigration in any war or in any major upheaval. Yet more terrifying was the lack of organization, which permitted these unfortunate people to clog up the roads in Belgium and France and prevented the advancing French armies from reaching points where they could have resisted with some chance of success the attacks of the Teuton tank divisions.

## Chapter 5

### THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

THE unnerving period of the "war of nerves."

I have described Hitler's *Blitzkrieg* in the Low Countries and France as I saw it; but the *Blitzkrieg* would be ineffective unless preceded by another of Hitler's weapons—the "war of nerves." What is this most modern and most devastating weapon of the Germans? In reality it is almost as old as civilization. Hitler, the enemy and persecutor of the Jewish race, learned from its history and practice not only the doctrines of racial purity and of intolerance but also the war of nerves.

For what, after all, was the chief weapon of Joshua? The symbolical description of the collapse of the walls of Jericho before the trumpets of Joshua's army: is not this in reality just Doctor Goebbels's propaganda and war of nerves bringing down the Maginot Line of Czechoslovakia? Did not Joshua conquer the other kings by intimidation? His unknown propaganda minister spread rumours that the Hebrew armies were irresistible and the Jewish weapons superior; and kingdom after kingdom folded up before him. Fourteen hundred years later, moreover, the Hun conqueror Attila used the war of nerves, succeeding in spreading the fame of the bravery and cruelty of his troops, which always intimidated the enemy.

There is, however, another aspect of the war of nerves.



## THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

The Germans assured their adversaries, time and again, that they had no aims against them. During this period of false security felt by their adversaries, they gained time, and could develop a system of agents: the famous Fifth Column. Is this method new, either? No, by no means. It was during a lull in the siege of Troy that the Greeks withdrew, leaving behind a huge wooden horse. Believing that the withdrawal was final, most of the Trojan notables counselled bringing the horse within the walls of Troy. Laocoön, the early predecessor of Winston Churchill and of Dorothy Thompson, warned in vain. Serpents, trained by the Greek Gestapo, proved to the Trojans how stupid were the objections of this timid priest. Thus the story of Troy has in it the germs of both the fake-security period of the war of nerves and the Fifth Column.

Doctor Goebbels knew both mythology and the Bible. He took a leaf from each one. And so was born the German version of the modern war of nerves. These two variants of the war of nerves were alternatively employed by the masters of Nazi Germany. In the early period of their rule they had honeyed words for all, and even concluded a treaty of non-aggression and friendship in 1934 with their then greatest enemy, the Poles. Probably Hitler thought, "I want to fatten you, before I eat you."

How glad were the Poles when, in consequence of this treaty, German direct assault was now launched, not on them but on little Austria!

The French and the British were equally pleased. The assault went east and not west. It is true that in the meantime Hitler had torn up the military clauses of the Versailles Treaty, and in March, 1936, had marched into the Rhineland; but he had assured both Britain and France in

his speech delivered on the occasion of the entry of his troops into the Rhenish province: "I solemnly pledge that I have no territorial claims in western Europe." This was then number two of the war of nerves strategy.

In Austria Hitler and his satellites employed still other tactics, the most shameless of terrors designed to intimidate the pocket-chancellor of the small Austrian Republic, Doctor Engelbert Dollfuss. Young Nazi storm-troopers threw bombs into jewellers' shops and cafés frequented by Jewish clientèle; innumerable anonymous letters threatened the lives of the Chancellor and his collaborators; bridges and railroad lines were blown up, and Jews and Socialists assailed in the suburbs by Nazi S.A. troops, armed with knives and bombs.

Illegal propaganda was smuggled on Danube River barges into Austria. Similarly barges floating on the river, and coming from German Passau, clandestinely brought arms and ammunition for Austrian Nazi storm-troops, and these were disembarked during the night in obscure places, with the aid of customs officials secretly enrolled in the Nazi Party. The organization of the secret Nazi ranks affected by then the ranks of the army, the police, the State officials, the students. Thus the Fifth Column was already in the midst of the country when the war of nerves threatened Austria by annihilation through the terror methods employed by these agents.

The years 1933 and the first half of 1934 passed in such an atmosphere of terror and intimidation. In July, 1934, however, the Nazis went over to direct action, and engineered a *Putsch* which caused the death of Chancellor Dollfuss, but which failed to oust the existing régime in Austria. Dr. Kurt von Schuschnigg became Chancellor,

## THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

and now, partly with Italian help and partly on their own initiative, the German Nazis tried to alter their tactics, namely to the siren song of peace and friendship. Suave and shrewd Franz von Papen, Germany's record man in losing diplomatic brief-cases, was dispatched to Vienna as the special ambassador of Adolf Hitler. He brought this time an olive branch freshly cut from an Italian grove, and whispered into von Schuschnigg's ear, "Peace, peace!"

Not that von Schuschnigg believed in the flageoleted siren song of the arch-duper. But he needed a truce and pretended to be ready to accept it. Meanwhile the Germans started to reorganize their illegal Austrian Nazis, whose ranks were badly shattered by the arrests following the July *Putsch*, while von Schuschnigg hoped to reinforce *his* defence troops against further Nazi assaults. The German Nazis and the Austrian Government trusted each other as two rival bankers do when, for some reason, they must suspend for a short time their cut-throat competition. With daggers behind their backs the two parties were whispering love to each other, with occasional stormy outbursts impeding the work of "reconciliation."

Yet, under Italian pressure, von Schuschnigg had to agree to accept a treaty of friendship which aimed at suspending "hostilities" and establishing normal relations. The treaty was concluded on July 11, 1936, a sad day in Austrian history. Hitler scored a full point in the war-of-nerves game. In this war it was of eminent importance for Hitler to pose as the promoter of peace. He could now point out at home that, though his heart was bleeding because the union of all Germans had been again delayed, he had brought this sacrifice only in the interest of peace. The same argument was spread abroad, and many English-

men and Frenchmen who belonged to the class known later as "appeasers" hailed the act of July 11 as a great move for peace by Hitler.

The Austrian Chancellor, however, realized that this was not so. The Austro-German treaty of friendship was just a truce, and nothing but a truce. It was necessary to accept it while Italy was having her sanctions fight with the Western democracies, and until Germany could reorganize the badly shattered ranks of the Austrian Nazis who were persecuted by the Austrian authorities.

The Germans now tried to reorganize the illegal Nazi movement. The insincerity of the Berlin rulers as well as that of the Austrian Nazis is best shown by the action of their leaders in those days. The former Nazi Party was dissolved in Austria, and its members had been persecuted since 1934. But the more prominent leaders got together and organized a group, called "emphatically national" (*betont national*), which, while professing to be based on the new Austrian constitution, was in reality the nucleus of new underground work amongst the illegal Nazis.

Nothing is more characteristic than an incident which happened to me in those days. The visible head of the "emphatically national" group was Doctor Hermann Neubacher, an extremely able and intelligent person who after the ascent of the Nazis to power in Austria became the mayor of Vienna. I visited him repeatedly, occasionally also with my colleague, John Gunther. One day I asked Doctor Neubacher whether he would give me an interview regarding the development of this pro-Nazi "emphatically national" movement. Doctor Neubacher was a clever and cautious person, and he knew that if the interview were published under a sensational headline and telegraphed back

THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"  
from the United States to Austria, he might be arrested. So he very wisely said:

"I cannot give you an interview, but I'm willing to give you a written statement." (In this case he was in possession of a copy of his exact words, should the police question him!) "Today is Wednesday; come on Friday, and you'll get the statement."

I visited Doctor Neubacher's office in the Trattnerhof on Friday. Instead of his woman secretary, two husky persons with Hitler moustaches were in his ante-room; I discovered immediately that they were Austrian detectives and that I had walked into a police trap. The Government had apparently ordered the arrest of Doctor Neubacher and the police were now searching his office. Since the detectives posed as secretaries, however, I accepted the "game," and with an innocent face told them that I was a newspaperman who wanted to get some information from the "Herr General-Director" (this was the title of Doctor Neubacher). The "secretaries" regretted that the Herr General-Director was absent, and I left the office knowing that the head of the secret Nazi movement was under arrest, and that I should probably never see my statement.

How great was my astonishment when my tipster, who kept me in contact with the Nazis, asked me to come to a certain place, where he introduced to me a young man wearing spectacles.

"My name is Doctor Arthur Seyss-Inquart," said my new acquaintance. "Doctor Neubacher" (who by then was in a concentration camp) "is sending you the promised statement. I hope that we can keep in touch with each other as long as Doctor Neubacher is prevented from giving you personally the necessary information."

I was flabbergasted, And so my acquaintance with Doctor Arthur Seyss-Inquart began. Doctor Neubacher was later smuggled by secret Nazi workers to Berlin, where he became director of the I.G. Farbenindustrie, the great German dye trust, and in this capacity he was a moving spirit in organizing the Nazi movement in Austria from without.

Doctor Seyss-Inquart, who was a former schoolmate of Doctor von Schuschnigg's at the Jesuit college Stella Matutina, enjoyed the Austrian Chancellor's confidence; but while the latter believed that Doctor Seyss-Inquart was deflecting the illegal Nazi movement unto legal channels, he was in reality organizing the underground movement which was to sweep away von Schuschnigg's rule. And this man was later appointed Minister of the Interior in Austria! The goat was made the keeper of the cabbage plot!

All this belonged to the armoury of the war of nerves. The Germans surrounded von Schuschnigg with spies and Nazi agents, to such an extent that the Chancellor no longer knew whom he could trust. I know that he realized that a number of his own *entourage* were working for the Nazis, that some of his own detectives and body-guards were in contact with his great adversary in Berlin. He realized also that the Nazi movement had undermined the police and the state officials to an alarming extent, and was making headway in the army. How nerve-shaking must have been this phase of the war of nerves!

The stage was now set for further action. The illegal Nazi movement was reorganized. Then suddenly Herr von Papen, the bringer of the olive branch of 1936, realized that the time for action had arrived. He suggested that his chief invite von Schuschnigg "to a cup of tea" at Berchtes-

## THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

gaden. Even this "invitation" has a precedent in history. It was in 1541 that the mighty Turkish sultan Suleiman was besieging the strong fortress of Buda, capital of Hungary. The greater part of the country was already in his possession, but Buda was still an obstacle. Why sacrifice the lives of thousands of Janissaries if other, more subtle methods would obtain the same result? So Suleiman invited the Dowager-Queen Isabella to come with her minor son, John Sigismond, to pay a visit to his tent in the besieging camp. She came. The Queen soon noticed too much liveliness in the camp and wanted to leave. The Sultan thereupon politely reminded her: "The lunch is not yet finished; the black soup" (this is what black coffee was then called) "will be served in a minute."

During the "black soup" interval the Janissaries succeeded in overpowering the unsuspecting garrison of the fortress, who thought that nothing could happen while their queen was in the tent of the Sultan. In Hungary even now people say, "The black soup is coming" when they want to state that the worst is yet to be expected.

Von Schuschnigg walked also into the trap of Hitler. There, in this final episode of the war of nerves, he was subjected to an eleven-hour mental third degree. Hitler shouted at him, addressed him contemptuously as "Herr Schuschnigg," and called his generals in one after the other, asking, "How long would it take you to march into Austria?" Exhausted by threats and surrounded only by enemies, von Schuschnigg yielded and accepted the Trojan horse as a solution: he promised to make Doctor Seyss-Inquart Minister of the Interior.

In Czechoslovakia the many varieties of the war of nerves were employed again. First came the nice flageoleted

peace talk. When Austria fell, Goering assured the Czechoslovak minister, as well as the British ambassador in Berlin, that he had no intentions against Czechoslovakia and that Germany wanted to live on friendly terms with her southern neighbour.

In May, 1938, the tone changed and the second phase of the war of nerves created an apparent conflict between Germany and Czechoslovakia, which by the third week of May became so tense that Czechoslovakia ordered the mobilization of her army, in face of the apparently pending German attack. Then came the assurances that Germany had no intention of attacking Czechoslovakia, and that the whole myth about an impending attack was the work of the British secret service and existed only in the imaginations of the warmongers. The following weeks and months were lived in an atmosphere of threats and alternating assurances, but always the tactics of the mental third degree were kept up against Doctor Beneš.

If the war of nerves in Austria was unilateral, in Czechoslovakia the rulers of that country were assailed from two sides; by the Nazi propaganda and diplomatic service, and by the Allied appeasers. While German troop concentrations were reminding the Czechs that their country could be the victim of a Nazi invasion any day, Nazi agents in London and Paris (and Washington) tried to spread the yarn that Germany had no intention of occupying Czechoslovakia, but that her intention was to liberate the Sudeten Germans, who were suffering both politically and economically under Czech tyranny. "Sing a song about oppressed people, and I immediately listen to you" was for long the watchword of democracies. It is, however, difficult to judge how far the complaints of any oppressed minority are



## THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

justified. Well, the Nazis succeeded in gaining the help of the appeasers, who were completely ignorant that Germany wanted world domination, that the elimination of Austria and Czechoslovakia was necessary to avert the danger of a two-front war, and that the destruction of Czechoslovakia was essential to Germany in order for her to break up the Russo-French alliance system.

When in 1937 I warned British statesmen that Germany wanted world domination, and that if Austria and Czechoslovakia were not saved, then Germany would be able to destroy France, they just smiled and called me either too excitable or too anti-Nazi. I was not anti-Nazi; I only saw things as they were. But the leading British personalities, belonging to the appeasing group, explained to me that Germany could not be kept down for ever (which was true); that she must be satisfied (but you cannot satisfy Hitler, even if there were a possibility of satisfying the previous Germany); that Germany must expand toward the south-east, so that she would not dream of attacking the west; and that if she conquered the south-eastern European countries she could organize them—she providing labour and enterprise, and England the money. How naïve were these friends!

Yet in August, 1938, there was full co-operation between the German wolf and the Anglo-French appeasers, who were determined to force Czechoslovakia into surrender—namely, into acceptance of the detachment of the Sudeten lands.

This was achieved by a concerted act of mental third degree exercised upon Doctor Beneš. On the one hand, the German army was kept in readiness, concentrated on the Czech borders. On the other, long negotiations took place.

The British, partly to gain time, and partly to induce the Czechs to yield on the Sudeten question, sent the Runciman mission, to be part of this mental blackmail. I must acquit Lord Runciman—he did not know that he was accessory to a crime. Ashton-Gwatkin, able, huge and ginger-haired, was his right-hand man. He was an economic expert, and a collaborator of Sir Horace Wilson, the “grey eminence” of the appeasers.

Ashton-Gwatkin, however, was a versatile fellow. His first fame he achieved under the pseudonym John Parrot. He wrote the sensational books *Banzai* and *Kimono* while in Japan, and thereby earned everlasting hatred from the sons of Nippon. In Czechoslovakia he wrote no novels; he negotiated, shrewdly, silently, almost with Japanese efficiency. Day after day the net around Czechoslovakia was drawn tighter.

Then came the decisive moments, before Munich. Without Doctor Beneš, the President of the country, no decision could be made. All the weight of decision rested on the shoulders of this small, wiry man. But even this once-tough sportsman was only a man. European police very often use mental third degree if they want to extort a confession. They do not let their prisoners sleep. The Nazis, with British and French help, did the same to Doctor Beneš. While the President had to conduct long negotiations with his own politicians all day long, the Nazis delivered one ultimatum after another at nightfall. It was almost usual that the German minister, Herr von Eisenlohr, came to see the President at 2 a.m., handing over a new demand of his Government. And at 4 a.m. the British and French ministers demanded audience. They stated that their Governments thought that Czechoslovakia should

## THE UNNERVING PERIOD OF THE "WAR OF NERVES"

yield, and that in case the crisis should bring about a war, the responsibility for an armed conflict would rest entirely on Czechoslovakia's shoulder and thus she could not count on allied help.

If Doctor Beneš could have had more sleep, probably he would have realized that, despite these talks, in case of war France would be compelled to come to Prague's help and that Russia would send at least aerial aid. But the man who for weeks had no more than an hour or two of sleep each night was exhausted. If Masaryk had lived, perhaps the tactics of the conspirators would have failed. But left alone, with no trusted or able man on his side, Doctor Beneš was reduced to a nervous wreck; he could not decide to answer Germany, "If you attack, I fight." And as he could not utter these decisive words, Munich came. And Czechoslovakia was finished.

Just as the burglar returns to his old methods, so does Germany. The same methods of the war of nerves were exercised in Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium. Formula: Today whisper peace, and tomorrow mobilize; confuse your enemy, weaken his resistance, cause division in the home ranks, explain how mighty is the German air force and how little use there is in resisting; and when the rulers and people are sufficiently intimidated—then strike. And strike quickly. This preliminary phase of the German *Blitzkrieg* was anything but *Blitz*—it was slow, enervating, and destructive. But effective. And the war of nerves was just as essential a part of the totalitarian war as was its second phase, the *Blitzkrieg*.

## Chapter 6

### GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

It was the Nationalist general Quiapo de Llano, as everyone knows, who gave the Fifth Column its name, when he boasted that besides the four columns marching openly on Madrid in November, 1936, a fifth column was working subversively within the city, disintegrating its resistance. But only the name is new. It was really Fifth Column work that caused the war of 1914.

At that time, the Austrian emperor was an old man, and his heir, the Archduke Francis Ferdinand, dreamt of reconstructing the ramshackle empire by a new federal constitution, giving, amongst other things, autonomy to the southern Slavs. Little Serbia, whose imperialistic dreams of enlarging herself at the expense of Austria were supported by Tsarist Russia, saw a decisive danger to her ambitions if the Archduke's plans were executed. For this reason, a group of Serbian patriots brewed a conspiracy which ended the life of the Austrian dreamer, who could have solved the problem of Central Europe. His murder brought about the World War in August, 1914, and since it left the problem unsolved, brought about also the rise of Adolf Hitler, who solved it in a way that should make the Archduke turn in his grave.

This conspiracy in Belgrade was a perfect pattern of the early Fifth Column. Bosnian and Croatian students, dis-

## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

satisfied with Austrian rule and sharing the ultra-nationalist views of their Serbian brethren, were lured to Belgrade, where they were equipped with money, revolvers, daggers, and bombs, and then were smuggled into Bosnia with the aid of false papers, or with the active help of the Serbian authorities, as well as by using the services of Austrian frontier guards who sympathized with the Serbian cause.

A moderate use of Fifth Columns was made during World War I, by both the Allies and Germany. Crewe House in London was a forerunner of Doctor Goebbels's office; it aimed at fomenting, by words and by emissaries, dissatisfaction in Germany and especially in Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey. The German general staff, again, used the services of Nikolai Lenin and of Leon Trotsky in bringing about a Bolshevik revolution in Russia. Thus Germany's Fifth Columnists, Lenin and Trotsky, were smuggled from Zürich to Russia, transported in sealed wagons through imperialistic Germany.

The two Fifth Columnists, Lenin and Trotsky, then used their methods elsewhere. Russian propaganda, Russian emissaries, Russian money, tried to cause dissension and sedition in all the countries of the world, hoping to bring down other régimes and establish Bolshevik rules in their stead.

The German Nazis learned, in reality, all their present methods from Bolshevik Russia: they perfected the tricks used by the Bolshevik agents all over the world in fomenting world revolution. If Fifth Columns used in the first World War helped Germany to prevent Russia from continuing to fight on the side of the Allies, in the present war they are being employed with scientific punctuality and with an organization which only the Germans can produce.

I have dealt in a fleeting fashion with the work of the Fifth Column in Austria and Czechoslovakia in my book *South of Hitler*,<sup>1</sup> but I want to show now how the Germans used this internal-explosive method with great success in Belgium, Holland, and parts of France.

The Hitler régime has been preparing for war ever since it came to power. The task of the Nazis at home was to create an army and a popular spirit which were as closely knit and efficiently organized as possible. This required highly trained soldiers, but also highly trained workers who could achieve the utmost production of war material in wartime. The youth was trained to endure such hardships that its efficiency and power of resistance was far superior to the enemy's. At the same time, the German propaganda systematically spread the yarn that Hitler was the apostle of peace, and that while he sought to gain for Germany her rightful place in the sun, he did not want to achieve these aims by force of arms.

The inscription on the Austrian war ministry building in Vienna was *Si vis pacem para bellum* ("If you want peace, prepare for war"), and Hitler in his Vienna days certainly saw this inscription very often. In his propaganda he took a leaf from this old Austrian motto; he persuaded the masses that his warlike preparations were not for the purpose of embarking on a war, but to avoid war. The army was only an instrument of his diplomatic game, and not a means of conquest.

Doctor Goebbels's propaganda had succeeded in getting this fallacy accepted, not only in Germany but also abroad, and it brought about the spirit in England and France which made possible the acceptance of the Austrian *fait*

<sup>1</sup> London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

*accompli* in the spring of 1938, and the blackmail of Munich six months later. But while Hitler was preparing his youth to be more efficient in warfare than the youth of any other country, at the same time he tried to use the various existing currents and movements in other countries which were to weaken for his purposes the internal cohesion and the will to defence in them.

Doctor Goebbels carefully studied the internal policy of each country that was on Germany's list of victims. Ever since the accession to power of Hitler, the National Socialists of Germany had seen one great danger; namely, that the various nations of Europe who felt themselves threatened by an expansive Germany would organize in one common front. The greatest bogey in Nazi eyes was the "collective security" so often voiced by progressives and democrats in the world, and later even much emphasized (but only for a time) by Russia. There is no doubt that if Britain and France had been led by visionaries instead of by petty politicians, they would have nurtured and encouraged the idea of collective security all over Europe, with or without the aid of the League of Nations.

There were seven countries around or near Germany in south-eastern and eastern Europe which felt themselves directly or indirectly menaced by her growing power: Poland, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. These countries represented a population of more than one hundred million people. Individually each one was too weak to resist German power; if, however, they could have overcome petty antagonism, their union would have created a mighty counterpoise to German expansion, especially if they could have devised a common plan of defence.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

In addition there were Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Switzerland, representing twenty-two million more souls, threatened by German schemes, and twelve million more in the Scandinavian countries. A combination representing as many persons as the entire population of the United States could certainly have resisted German aims and ambitions, especially because they would have found Great Britain and France on their side.

*Divide et impera* ("Divide and rule") was another maxim of the Hapsburg Empire. Hitler adapted it to read, "Divide your enemies and rule!" And thus, as the antidote to collective security, his greatest possible enemy, he invented the magic formula: *Neutrality*.

Don Juan used to whisper to every woman, "I love you," and he succeeded in fooling them all. Hitler, by no means a Don Juan, whispered into the ears of all his suspected enemies, "Neutrality!" And he succeeded. One country after the other hurried to declare itself "neutral" in case of a future conflagration. Only too late it learned that Hitler's words were only dope and dupery.

To attain this neutrality Hitler always found parties in every country to promote his aims. There was always a strong undercurrent of pacifism observable in most civilized countries. This pacifism was encouraged by all means by Nazi Germany. If possible, by nice words, if necessary, by bribery. Very often by threats.

"If you remain neutral, we have no aims against you. If, however, you start to arm, we must regard this as a provocation."

The Social Democrats at home were always regarded as arch enemies of the German Third Reich. But abroad the Socialists were regarded as "friends" because, as a rule,



## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

they were pacifists and against further armament expenditure. The Roman Catholics were also regarded as enemies in Nazi Germany and were badly persecuted. But abroad the Catholic was a friend because he was, as a rule, a pacifist on religious grounds.

Anti-Communism was, however, the great bait of the Germans. Industrialists, bankers, rich people, intellectuals in various countries neighbouring on Germany were decidedly anti-Bolshevik. These anti-Soviet tendencies were encouraged—remember the “Cliveden Set” and others in Britain, and the Comité des Forges in France, etc. And then one day Germany announced a treaty with Soviet Russia which was a surprise only to those who already wanted to be fooled.

Another form of Fifth Column activity was the encouragement of seditious movements, and especially the formation of Nazi parties in various neighbouring countries.

By all these methods, Germany succeeded in sapping the resistance of the various States opposing her, and in retarding or frustrating their preventive defences.

Now let us analyse the activities of the Nazis in countries which were involved in the last phase of the totalitarian war on the Continent of Europe.

It was in the second week of November, 1939, that I was suddenly addressed in German in the lobby of the Hôtel des Indes in The Hague:

“What, you are here? What are you doing here?”

The man who spoke to me was Baron V. von Hahn, the *Putsch* expert of the Nazis.

“Well, well, Herr Baron,” I answered, “I should really be more entitled to ask that question. I am a special correspondent who is sent to spots where the editors sense

danger. And my editor thinks that the invasion of this country by Germany is imminent. But what are *you* doing here?"

Baron von Hahn evasively answered:

"Does your editor really think that the invasion of Holland is imminent? It *was* imminent. But you came too late."

Then he thought for a moment and added:

"Or too early."

I had met von Hahn, a Baltic baron and friend of Alfred Rosenberg, in Vienna when he was correspondent of the German official news agency, where his chief duty was to engineer a *coup* which later ended in the assassination of Doctor Dollfuss, after which Baron von Hahn hurriedly left Austria.

In Hungary, where he was Press chief of the German Legation, he tried to engineer a *Putsch* of the Magyar Nazis, but was politely asked to leave the country. He was not exactly expelled, but the circumstances of his departure were reminiscent of an expulsion. He was expelled in the same way from Belgium, and he had to leave Copenhagen also in somewhat of a rush. Everywhere his duty was to spread dissension and to sow the seeds of mutual distrust and confusion amongst internal political parties.

I mention Baron von Hahn because he is a typical example of the German agent who has to prepare Fifth Column activities in a foreign country, and because his case illustrates best the activities and versatility of these organizers. His duty in Holland was twofold: first, he had to cultivate his old acquaintances and thereby promote Naziism; and, second, through his knowledge of foreign languages he was to promote pacifism and neutrality.

## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

I saw Baron von Hahn frequently in the company of the Reverend Blake, an American clergyman, who was the representative of the Oxford Movement in Scandinavia and Holland. At tea-parties of the Reverend Blake Baron von Hahn was able to meet high-ranking members of Dutch society, because the Oxford Movement had deep roots in that country and patronizers of it were to be found in all the highest circles. Queen Wilhelmina herself was sympathetic to the aims of the movement. Through these intermediaries, the Queen was assured by important emissaries that Germany had no aim on Holland, so long as Holland adhered to the strictest neutrality. And since Wilhelmina was an ardent peace-lover, it was easy for these agents to encourage her natural instincts.

Prince Bernhard, another member of the Dutch royal house, was again influenced by the able German minister, Herr von Zeck, who through his intimate friendship with the prince was able to encourage Dutch pacifism and desire for neutrality. The Roman Catholics and the Social Democrats were all for pacifism, and the Germans encouraged the leaders of these parties, who often not only were ardent representatives of the unconditional-neutrality attitude, but also, as in the case of the Socialists, impeded Holland's rearmament by opposing sums to be voted for national defence. The Conservatives were incited against Russia, and thus were in sympathy with Nazi Germany, which they believed to be the great bulwark against Bolshevism.

But even more important was the encouragement of seditious parties within Holland. The most important of these was the Dutch Nazi Party (N.S.B.), whose nominal leader was A. Mussert, but whose real leader was his

deputy, Rost van Tonningen. I had known van Tonningen for many years because he was originally the assistant of the League of Nations Commissar for Austria, Doctor Zimmermann, and later himself became the Commissar for Austria on behalf of the League.

Some years ago Rost van Tonningen resigned his highly paid post in Vienna and returned to Holland to act as deputy leader of the Dutch Nazis, and editor of their daily paper, the *National Dagblad*. He and Baron von Hahn were good friends from the Vienna days, and thus the Baltic nobleman was entrusted with the task of helping the reorganization of the Dutch Nazi Party in every way; with money, arms, propaganda, etc. Thus Baron von Hahn, on the one hand, was leading the organization of this most important Fifth Column in Holland, which during the war actively helped on the side of the Germans; and on the other hand was promoting the neutrality and pacifist attitude of the Dutch through his Oxford Movement and other connections.

To promote all these Fifth Column activities the German Legation had an extensive staff. The Hague Legation alone had forty-three extra-territorial members, amongst them five counsellors, while the German Consulates in The Hague, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and other cities had huge staffs and were equipped to deal with far-reaching political and business organizations amongst the Fifth Columnists.

These activities naturally had to be supported by actual propaganda. Doctor Aschmann, one of the brilliant German diplomats of the old days, and former Press chief in the Wilhelmstrasse, was sent as chief of the Press Bureau to the Hague Legation, while other first-class journalists

## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

helped him in his task of collecting information and disseminating propaganda.

Fifth Columnists were collected in large numbers in the cities of Amsterdam, The Hague, Rotterdam, Herzogenbosh, etc. They came partly as tourists, partly as business men, and were helped by almost a hundred thousand resident Fifth Columnists. In addition, just on the eve of the totalitarian war mysterious barges floated down the Rhine, and arrived in Rotterdam just at dawn on May 10. These were "Trojan barges," for they contained three to four thousand German soldiers, who then, with the aid of the resident Fifth Column, the parachutists, and the "tourists," succeeded in capturing Rotterdam and the aerodrome of Vaalhaven.

These Fifth Columnists, operating behind the Dutch army, succeeded in preventing the provisioning of the army and thus caused the ultimate downfall of Holland.

The Fifth Columns in Belgium operated in a fashion not too different from the Dutch example. They aimed at undermining civil government, creating cells of unrest in the army, and promoting pacifism in the country.

King Leopold III was an easy prey of the Germans. Ever since his childhood, the young king had entertained a certain animosity against England (and indirectly against France), partly attributable to his unfortunate experience during his public-school days in England, where he lived as an exile during the first World War. Moreover, a charming German baroness played a rôle of importance in his recent life which is said to have influenced him also in favour of the Reich.

His military aide-de-camp, General van Overstraten,

apparently encouraged Leopold's somewhat pro-German inclinations, and with the aid of German emissaries it was not difficult to induce the young king to follow a policy of absolute neutrality, "independence," and to persuade him to refuse to make any military (or political) arrangement with the Western Powers.

The Roman Catholic premier, Hubert Pierlot, while in his sympathies certainly pro-French, was a pacifist, and so was his Foreign Minister, Henri-Paul Spaak, a Social Democrat by party standing. The once famous Social Democratic leader, de Man, went so far in his pacifism that he is today one of the supporters of King Leopold in running the country under German sovereignty.

What these ministers and politicians could not do, the German agents could. The German ambassador, Herr Vicco Karl Alexander von Buelow-Schwandte, once permanent secretary in the Wilhelmstrasse, was known as Germany's number-one intriguer. He was supported by an enormous staff, amongst them the once well-known Paris correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, Friedrich Sieburg, who had become counsellor of the German Embassy in Brussels and was running the German propaganda in France from that city.

The notorious Otto Abetz, a friend of Madame Bonnet, was the chief money distributor and arch intriguer in both France and Belgium, but when the war broke out he was recalled to Berlin to direct the propaganda in France from the German capital. His successor was a certain fellow called Liebe, who distributed funds among journalists and politicians, and was the chief organizer of the Fifth Column in Belgium.

The Germans exploited in Belgium all subversive move-

## GERMANY'S SECRET WEAPON: THE FIFTH COLUMN

ments, such as the German Nazis in Eupen, Malmedy, and St. Vith, three towns which before the first World War belonged to Germany; the Flemish extremists, who had twenty-one deputies in Parliament and whose leader, Leclercq, was a willing tool of Germany; and the Fascist-Rexist movement of Léon Degrelle, a Frenchman by birth who became a complete servant of the German Nazis.

This Fifth Column activity helped the *débâcle* of the Belgian army. By bribery and by exploiting Flemish nationalism, they bought officers or induced them to act in Germany's interest, and this explains why the bridges were not blown up on the Meuse and why the Eben-Emael fort fell so early.

German Fifth Columnists spread terror amongst the population in Belgium, encouraging the people to flee. These refugees then clogged the roads and in consequence delayed the incoming help. Fifth Columnists also aided in promoting the parachutist psychosis.

In the Rue Royale in Brussels there is a column reminiscent of that of the Roman Emperor Trajan, and of the one in Paris in the Place Vendôme. It is called the Congress or "Independence" Column and was erected in memory of the declaration of independence of Belgium in 1830. The monument which commemorates the fall of this independence is the ill-famed Fifth Column.

## Chapter 7

### WHY COLLAPSE?

VIEWING it in retrospect, we all should have known it. Many people say that they knew that France would collapse, but I often doubt their genuineness. The only people who realized with fair certainty that the collapse was bound to come were the leaders of the German army and of the German Nazis. They could keep secret their own armaments, their own preparations and their schemes, while their excellent espionage system knew all the weaknesses of France and most of those of Great Britain. (They probably knew much more of the weaknesses of Great Britain than of her still inherent strength and morale.)

I must confess that, like many of my well-informed friends, I trusted the traditional military genius of the French officers and the strength of the French army. My field of operation was between the Allies and Germany; I had no chance to study directly either the French or the German army and its equipment, but my friends in Paris, many of them resident correspondents for decades, assured me that the French army still remained the best in the world, despite the phenomenal rise of the army of her great opponent.

From friends—American friends—who visited Germany or were correspondents in Berlin, I, however, got warnings to the contrary. In the early autumn of 1938, just before



## WHY COLLAPSE?

Munich, I made a motor tour around the Czech fortifications, in company with the American military attaché in Berlin and a well-known American friend. The attaché spoke highly of the organization, discipline, and quality of the new German army, and after seeing the Czech defence lines, which were somewhat on the pattern of the Maginot Line, he pointed out that the Germans had weapons to overcome many of these difficulties. He could not tell us about those new or improved arms, because he was bound to observe discretion, but it is certain that he reported about them to the War Department in Washington. If Washington knew about those arms, why did not Paris or London take cognizance?

In November, 1939, my old friend, Oswald Garrison Villard, arrived in The Hague from Berlin and was tremendously impressed by the strength of German armaments. He told me that the Nazis would have thirty thousand planes and twelve thousand tanks by the spring and that they would attack. They would use *Blitzkrieg* tactics and were confident of success. Villard assured me that the information on which he relied came not from Nazi sources but from his old friends in the Reichswehr. I must also confess I did not take sufficient notice of Villard's warning, simply because in 1921, coming from Soviet Russia, he had been equally impressed by Russia's preparedness. But Russia is not Germany.

Karl von Wiegand, the well-known foreign correspondent, coming from Berlin, also prophesied an imminent big fight in the West, emphasized the strength and discipline of the new German army, and pointed out that Germany was rapidly becoming imbued with a revolutionary spirit which would help her move against the West. I thought

that Karl was too optimistic about Germany's strength, as we all knew that he had a warm sympathy for her.

I received constant warnings from still another source: my colleague in Berlin, Wallace Deuel, of the *Chicago Daily News*. He was a serious observer, was not accessible to any propaganda, and had no axe to grind, and yet he continually warned me about the coming danger, also about the invincible strength of the German army. It is characteristic of German methods that this big prison country gave more freedom to correspondents than did the democracies. Thus I was unable to telephone to my wife in England; I could not telephone, on either political or private matters, to my colleagues in London and Paris, but once a week when I was in Brussels and The Hague I used to call Wallace Deuel in Berlin and discuss the situation with him. The picture which Wally gave, both in his messages and in these conversations, was gloomy. It showed not only the growing strength of Nazi Germany, but also her determination to seek an issue before the summer of 1940.

Yet because of our confidence in France's great military strength, while recognizing Germany's rapid rise to might and her immense increase in striking power, we doubted that she could hope for a quick victory. The Allies calculated on Germany's economic weakness. Though, thanks to her cunning tactics, Germany was able to assure supplies from south-eastern Europe which made her economically more independent in this war than in the last one, there were many things which she lacked for the continuation of a long war. Amongst the materials which she missed most were iron ore and oil.

The loss of Alsace-Lorraine through the Treaty of

## WHY COLLAPSE?

Versailles had deprived Germany of 80 per cent of her home production of iron ore, and yet even before the Great War she was compelled to import 50 per cent of her requirements. The loss of this province meant that for many years she could produce at home only 10 to 16 per cent of her needed iron ore, and even with all the frantic efforts of Goering and his economic advisers, she could not surpass one-third of her legitimate peace-time requirements. This lack of iron ore absolutely necessitated both the Norwegian campaign and the reconquest of Lorraine.

More serious even than the lack of ore was the lack of petrol in Germany. Her peace-time consumption in the last year before the war was 7,700,000 tons, but the requirements during the totalitarian war are much in excess of this figure, even allowing for a drastic reduction in the use of private automobiles. A motorized division is calculated to use 40,000 tons of petrol per month. The aeroplanes were using up fuel at an even more rapid rate, and for the far-distance-flying services a very high grade of fuel (octane) was needed. When the war broke out, the oil companies in Holland calculated that Germany had only two months' supply of petrol in case she went over to totalitarian war methods. This circumstance alone forced Hitler to strike quickly.

The only question was whether the totalitarian war could be conducted successfully before these petrol supplies were exhausted? Hitler had repeated conferences with his generals. Russian supplies of petrol were not forthcoming, partly because the Russians needed it for themselves, having exhausted their own supplies during the totalitarian war in Finland, and partly because of transport difficulties, but also because they were not too eager to help Germany to

an easy success. Rumanian supplies were again held up by the unusually severe winter which caused the Danube to be frozen for four months, and thus shipping was made impossible during the winter and the early spring.

Yet Hitler knew that he had to strike in the spring of 1940 or never! If he had waited, British and French armaments and especially aerial armaments would have reached a level where his own enormous superiority was no longer sufficient to bring about a quick decision. Moreover, he could not wait until his oil supplies were completely exhausted or evaporated.

Therefore he asked Brauchitsch, the German commander-in-chief: "Can we win the *Blitzkrieg* in less than two months—let's say, in six weeks?"

"There is a chance," said Brauchitsch.

"Is this chance greater than fifty-fifty?" asked Hitler.

When Brauchitsch answered in the affirmative, Hitler said:

"Then we will do it."

And he did it.

Now, of course, with Alsace-Lorraine recovered and with the French iron mines safely in her possession, Germany is no longer in need of large ore supplies from abroad. The deposits of former German Alsace-Lorraine were estimated at 800,000,000 tons, while the French Nancy-Briey-Longwy basin is estimated to contain 2,500,000,000 tons. As soon as these mines are reorganized, Germany will be able to obtain from them at least 40,000,000 tons of ore, corresponding to a production of about 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 tons of ore. But even so she will be obliged, even at her 1938 rate of iron or steel production of 23,000,000 tons, to import ore from Bilbao and Rio

## WHY COLLAPSE?

Tinto in Spain and from Gellivara and Kirunavara in Sweden.

But although the success of his totalitarian war in France and Belgium has solved Hitler's problem with regard to iron ore, it has not solved his oil and petrol problem, except temporarily. The loot of oil and petrol was enormous in Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France, but at the same time British air raids have destroyed important depots of oil everywhere.

German success in France brought Rumania into the Axis, assuring the great part of the Rumanian oil supplies to the Axis powers. But Rumanian wells, which only a few years ago produced 8,500,000 tons of oil convertible into petrol, are constantly decreasing in production, because they are slowly being exhausted. The present annual production is hardly more than 6,500,000 tons (of this at least 3,000,000 tons is needed by Italy). Even if Germany's home production of oil increases (it was 590,000 tons in 1938, and now the Austrian and Czech petrol will be counted in with it), and even if she increases her manufacture of synthetic petrol, made from coal, to 3,000,000 tons, she will still lack fuel for a future totalitarian war. That is why many observers believe that Germany will have to fight it out with Soviet Russia because she needs the oil wells of Baku, or that she will have to push again along the Berlin-Bagdad road to occupy the oil wells of Mosul and Persia.

Hitler, as I said, gambled on the *Blitzkrieg*. His generals calculated that at least six weeks would be necessary to push through Holland and Belgium to northern France—they did it in five weeks!

They certainly were favoured by fair weather. Had the

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

sunshiny hot weather turned into a period of rain and storms the motorized divisions, especially the motor-cycles, tanks, and armoured cars, would have stuck in the mud; cloudy weather would have frustrated the work of the air force, and especially would have made co-operation between the aeroplanes and the motorized divisions extremely difficult.

Many of you would say at this juncture, "Hitler again had luck."

Yes and no. The fact that the campaign of the *Blitzkrieg* was made in good weather was due greatly to the immense development of German meteorological science and the co-operation of the German Fifth Columns everywhere with the German weather prophets.

When during one of my telephone conversations with Wally Deuel in January, 1940, I asked him what the next German move would be, he said that nothing very important would occur during the winter, but that we must count on a heavy aerial bombardment of England should the weather prophets guarantee a spell of ten days' fine weather.

I said to Wally, "But you cannot foretell the weather for ten days, can you?"

Wally answered, "Oh, German meteorological science has advanced so much that the weather prophets can now predict the possible trend of weather for more than ten days to come."

And the weather prophets in Berlin were helped by members of the Fifth Column in England, Holland, and Belgium, who sent weather reports regularly on secret short-wave transmitters! Repeatedly German spies were arrested in Rotterdam and other Dutch cities who with

the aid of short-wave radios were sending such reports to Berlin.

Everything was prepared for the totalitarian war with the same thoroughness. To make a break-through effective on the Belgian or Dutch lines, it had to be followed by the fastest possible advance of motorized columns. But the Dutch and the Belgians had removed all road signs in the frontier districts. "Never mind," said the German commanders; and every sergeant in the motorized columns had to learn by heart the map of his sector. The non-commissioned officers knew every turn of the road, and thus it happened that they never went wrong, though when I motored in Holland with chauffeurs who knew the country well, the road was repeatedly lost just because the road signs were missing. With the knowledge of the road, and in the worst case with triangular geodetic devices, it was always quickly found, and the irresistible advance continued.

But it is wrong to put all the blame for failure on the French and Belgian armies. There was much in the democratic system of Governments which made Germany's task much easier than it would have been had opponents been totalitarian countries.

Today it has become a commonplace to say that Germany was preparing for this totalitarian and lightning war, while France was preparing for the *last* war—meaning that France was living in the mentality of the last war. This is not quite true. In many respects France lived in the mentality of the first World War and prepared according to what she thought were the lessons of that war. Yet even in the former war it was an admitted axiom that the offensive was the best weapon. But how could France take the

offensive? As the Maginot Line made German offensive against France impossible, the construction of the West-wall (Siegfried Line) frustrated French hopes of a direct attack on Germany. There remained possible therefore only an attack through the Low Countries—which could be operated either way. But France and Great Britain guaranteed the independence of Belgium in April, 1937. A democratic country, whose Government was based on a liberal morale and ethics, simply could not take the risk of invading a country which was friendly and democratic and much smaller than herself. Moreover, the French and British Governments had to take into consideration public opinion in the United States! Just imagine the outcry that would have been raised in this country had Britain and France occupied the Low Countries and thus saved them from German totalitarian war! Yet France had an interest in manning the Belgian lines before Germany was ready to attack, and Great Britain would certainly have needed Holland as an “aerial bridgehead” against German bombing attempts.

In fact, there was a short period when the French and British general staffs contemplated such a “preventive” occupation. They received reports in April, 1940, just at the time of the occupation of Norway, that Germany was contemplating a *Blitzkrieg* via Holland and Belgium. They counselled their Governments that the only effective way to prevent this would be the occupation of the Low Countries. Under the force of arguments by the military experts, the two Governments considered this proposition, and the British and French ministers and ambassadors in The Hague and in Brussels made a “friendly” *démarche* toward the respective Governments, asking them to demand



## WHY COLLAPSE?

British and French help immediately in manning their defences, before the Germans were ready to attack. The Low Countries refused the offer—they were simply horrified! Thus the British and French were deprived of the chance to take the offensive because public opinion in their countries and in America would have revolted against “violation” of the neutrality of Holland and Belgium, even if this move had ultimately proved to be their salvation.

This finally forced the French and British into taking the defensive, leaving to the Germans the chance of the initiative in the campaign. The power that takes the offensive can choose the time, the day, the hour, the place, and the extent of the coming battle. The attacker can concentrate his forces on vital points, while those in the defence forces have to be on the watch all the time and all along the entire line.

The impossibility for a democratic country of taking the offensive if it means the violation of a small neutral nation has proved fatal to Britain and especially to France. Will the United States learn the lesson? Just at present there are vantage points vital to that country which, if occupied by Germans or Italians, may become the most dangerous centres of future attack against the country, especially from the air. This holds good especially for Greenland, which belonged to neutral Denmark until the Germans occupied the mother country, and of the Portuguese possessions in the Atlantic, especially the islands of the Azores, the Cape Verdes, and Madeira, as well as the African colony of Portuguese Guinea.

For reasons of self-defence these vantage points should be occupied before Powers which entertain ambitions in the Western Hemisphere have established themselves

firmly there. Both Greenland and the Azores are most important for the United States from the point of view of aerial defence; the first is the gateway to Canada, the other the first important aerial hop in air raids against the U.S.A. With the rapid development of long-range bombers the Azores, which are only two thousand one hundred miles from the east coast of the U.S.A., are becoming the natural protection for the lives of the inhabitants of Boston, New York, Washington, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and therefore more important than Hawaii, the defence of which is accepted as a necessary duty.

Let us return to France. Having lost the chance of taking the offensive, the French had to remain on the defensive. They had, of course, the Maginot Line. Its fundamental idea was good. It is now a custom to pooh-pooh the importance and value of this defence line, of which people used to talk in superlatives. Most commentators now describe the Maginot Line as obsolete or superseded by events. It is not true. Germany produced no really new offensive weapons in this war and only perfected the old means of offensive. The Maginot Line, in turn, was the last word in the perfection of the defence methods of 1914-18. I am convinced that if the Germans had attempted a direct assault on it they would have failed. The mistake was not the building of this modern Chinese Wall, but the failure to extend it right to Dunkerque on the North Sea. This failure was due partly to the French belief that Belgium might be persuaded to come over to the French side, and mostly to the stupid obstruction of French politicians, who through corruption or a conviction that Germany would not attack France refused to vote the huge funds necessary for the completion of the line.

## WHY COLLAPSE?

After the outbreak of the war in September, 1939, the Maginot Line was strengthened and fortified. Leslie Hore-Belisha, the British War Minister, insisted that his country should pay for the extension of a strong Maginot Line to the North Sea—he knew what he was talking about—but “appeaser” Sir John Simon objected to such a huge expenditure. And Hore-Belisha had to go.

Lacking such a strong defence line to the north, the French should have perfected rapidly the weapons destined to meet the German attack. These were tanks, motorized or armoured columns, motor-cycles equipped with machine-guns, aeroplanes, and the radio, the latter assuring co-operation amongst the various weapons.

None of these weapons was really new. The tank was an English invention, manufactured during the last war by a Lincolnshire firm and first used in masses at Cambrai and the Somme offensive in September, 1916. The aeroplane is an American invention—one of the inventors is still living—and even today American planes are superior to German planes. But Germany manufactured aeroplanes in such large numbers that she attained a nearly five-to-one superiority over the French. And she had a similar superiority in tanks.

Defence measures against aeroplanes and tanks had been invented already in the first World War and perfected in the after-war period. It was democratic negligence and the skilful use of the Fifth Column in the democratic Parliaments by Germany that prevented large-scale armament by Britain and France—on a scale equal to Germany’s effort. Influenced by the soft wooings of German emissaries, believing in the promises of Nazi intriguers, the Chamberlains, the Astors, the Lothians (whose chief fault was that

they could not imagine that people can be as vicious and deceitful as were these German dupers) accepted the promises of Ribbentrop and his emissaries that Germany had no intentions or ambitions in Western Europe, and could be pacified provided that she could establish herself in her *Lebensraum*, south-eastern Europe.

These lords and rich manufacturers believed that Germany was a bulwark against Bolshevism, and readily accepted her word that she entertained no ambitions in the West. Yet what Germany really wanted was to attain an advance over French armament, to defer and impede the progress of French and British rearmament, and to prevent a large-scale manufacture of aeroplanes in those two countries.

France was in a worse position even than England. British politicians are at least honest; many French politicians were corrupt, or if they were not corrupt, they often became tools of Germany, because they hated far-distant Bolshevism more than near-by Naziism. They were hushed by Abetz, Sieburg, and their *consortes* into the belief that Nazi Germany was the saviour of capitalist Europe from Bolshevism and they were playing, knowingly or unknowingly, the game of Germany. Flandin was an open Nazi. His brother-in-law, the former Ambassador Noel, was previously France's representative in Czechoslovakia and Poland, and helped to undermine the French alliances with these two countries. M. Baudouin, director of the Banque de France-Indochine, important shareholder in the Djibuti Railroad, and a friend of the Fascist Powers, was smuggled into the confidence of Paul Reynaud through the mediation of France's fatal woman, the Countess Hélène de Portes, who was killed in June, 1940, in an automobile accident in

which Premier Reynaud suffered serious injuries. The wife of the former Foreign Minister, M. George Bonnet, was a friend of Otto Abetz, the notorious German agent in France. There was Marquet, the mayor of Bordeaux, and Deat and Doriot, all former Socialists, who became "Neo-Socialists" or outright Fascists! All these persons had helped, consciously or themselves being duped, to prevent France from doing her duty!

Another sad chapter was the breakdown of the Deuxième Bureau in France and of the secret service in England. The two democratic countries were apparently unaware of the nature and extent of German armaments. One can understand that the two services failed when it came to the ultimate secret plans of Germany, which after all are known only by a few. But to fail to get the armaments secrets was unpardonable, the more because many important ones originated from factories situated in occupied countries, where it was possible to establish contact with dissatisfied workers. It will be remembered that when Hitler marched into Austria, many of his tanks were found broken down on the roadside. This remained so even during the occupation of Prague, and it was evident that these failures were due partly to bad materials for bearings, and partly to the bad quality of the German Buna substitute for rubber. The French therefore remained in the belief that the German tanks were inferior to theirs.

But they ought to have known that the Germans were finding plenty of good material, both rubber for tyres and alloys for bearings, in Czechoslovakia, and later in Poland, and that the old faults were being remedied.

Moreover, the Germans found the secret of a good armourplate for tanks at the Skoda works in Pilsen. This

special steel, made with various rare metal alloys, was much lighter and yet more resistant than the plate used on the German tanks. Not only did the Germans equip their heavy tanks with this light yet resistant metal, but on the heaviest tanks they employed a double plate. Until the end of 1938 French firms had the controlling share of the Czech armament works. The French thus should have known that their 47-millimetre anti-aircraft shell was not good enough to pierce this armourplate. When during the war they discovered this, it was too late. They brought the famous seventy-fives into action against the German tanks, but these field-artillery pieces did not fire quickly enough and had no armour-piercing shells. The ordinary explosive shells were worthless against these monsters; it was like going bear-hunting with a rabbit-gun.

The quick dashes of the German motor-cyclist corps, rushing far behind the French lines and establishing machine-gun positions at distant points, came also as a surprise to the French, though it was an open secret that for many years the Germans had trained the Nazi youth and later the Reichswehr in these wild cross-country dashes on motor-cycles, equipped with sidecars and with machine-guns mounted on them.

There was also no reason why the rapid numerical development of the German air force was not sufficiently known in France. As to the co-operation among tanks, motor-cyclists, and aeroplanes, another important feature of the German *Blitzkrieg*, the Germans had already tried it out in Spain, and certainly practised it sufficiently in Poland and Norway. Where were the French and English observers in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39? The German "secret" was a mystery only to those who stuck

## WHY COLLAPSE?

their heads in the sand in ostrich-like fashion. It consisted in establishing the superiority of the machine over the man. In its final analysis the World War of 1914-18 remained a war of man against man; this new war, thanks to German resourcefulness, was converted into a war of the machine against man.

The ultimately outstanding weapon of the first World War, in a decisive sense, was the machine-gun. The Germans succeeded in overcoming it by developing two Anglo-Saxon inventions: the British-invented tank and the American-invented aeroplane. The French failed to establish mass production of weapons which could be used efficaciously against the German offensive weapons, the tank and the aeroplane. France should have defended herself by huge masses of aeroplanes (fighters as well as bombers) and by anti-tank guns and anti-aircraft guns. But the Germans succeeded in establishing a numerical superiority in both aeroplanes and tanks. By this superiority, they succeeded in winning this stage of the war, although they took the offensive, with the loss of only 156,000 men (of whom 27,000 were killed), while France's casualties amounted to one and a half million!

The machine proved much stronger than man.

## Chapter 8

### WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE COLLAPSE?

I SAW a great country collapse. And the collapse was complete.

We know *why* this collapse came about. But what is its real meaning?

There are several explanations for it. Probably the most generally accepted one sounds the simplest; this totalitarian war with its lightning technique is the culmination of two hundred years of preparation by Germany (or, as most people say, by Prussia) for expansion, ending in the mad lust of one man for world power and world domination. And these people add: Was not Frederick the Great, King of Prussia, the founder of German military tradition? Was his guard of giants not the original idea for the super-fit human material of the Third Reich?

Yes, it was Frederick the Great who started the expansionist lust in Prussia. Bismarck only exploited and enlarged it. When the troops of Emperor Wilhelm I, in spiked helmets, marched into Versailles, the ghost of Frederick was marching with them. And in 1914, just a little more than a generation after this entry of the Prussians into Paris, the troops of Kaiser Wilhelm II once more invaded France. Those who maintain that all that has happened recently is the legitimate continuation of Frederick's policy point out that Adolf Hitler's legions, when



## WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE COLLAPSE?

entering France, were only following truly the Frederician tradition.

There are others who go even further; they say that the German lust for conquest and the construction of the new Reichswehr is in reality the old Spartan tradition revived. How did the Spartans prepare for their wars? The male children were exposed to privations so that only the fittest could survive. From among the survivors, all boys at the age of seven were submitted to rigorous military training. At twenty they were enrolled in the ranks of the army and acted as heavily armoured infantrymen in the wars of Sparta. The males had to remain soldiers until they reached the age of sixty.

Does that not read almost exactly like Fascist Italy or Hitlerite Germany? Mussolini's country enlists the youngest as "wolf cubs" in the lowest grade of the youth movement; then, as *ballila*, the youth are trained in the use of rifles, while the training of the *avanguardisti* is the last stage before enlistment in the Fascist militia. In Germany the Hitler youth receive the first pre-military training, then serve in the ranks of the *Sturmabteilungen* (S.A. or brown shirts) or in the *Schutzstaffel* (S.S. or Black Guards), while all of them are later available for compulsory military service. Is that not Sparta over again? Have not the German youth to renounce all good things in life? They have to live for the State, just as the laws of Lycurgus demanded in Sparta; they have to "tighten their belts," as Goering demanded, and to live a simple life—exactly as did the youth in Sparta. The Nazis have to train in a way demanding the highest skill and the greatest courage. The young Germans have to risk their lives daily. For the State, just as in Sparta.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

While the Germans lived this simple Spartan life, while they renounced all amenities and pleasures of life in the interest of their idols, the Fuehrer and the State, what did the French do? Being conquering heroes of the last war, the French lived the life of the victor; they were idle, gay, and self-centred. Who cared for the State? French philosophy was always Epicurean, but it had become increasingly Cyrenaic after the first World War. "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die" was the motto of the post-war French generation as it was of the Romans in the days of Marius, the Epicurean.

The apologists of the militarist theory of explanation of recent events say therefore: Is it a wonder that Germany, of the Spartan and Frederician traditions, succeeded in beating France?

What they say is all true. But it is only partly true. This war is more than the lust for power of a single man, or the ambition for expansion of a single nation, or of two nations. All this expansion, totalitarianism, hatred, war, conquest, and subjugation is, in reality, part of a revolution on an enormous scale which has been sweeping over us for some time, only we did not notice it. We failed to notice it because we wished not to notice it. Because we do not like to take cognizance of things which are unpleasant to us. How difficult it was, for example, to believe that all was lost in France and Belgium! My senses, my instincts told me so, and yet I still counted on a miracle. Perhaps Weygand would effect a break-through in the German left flank. But with what? asked my mind. . . .

We saw totalitarian régimes rise, we observed Socialist régimes come and go; we saw changes in the nature of the Soviet régime; we heard with awe about the rearmament of

## WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE COLLAPSE?

Germany; we took notice of the unwillingness of French workers to labour for more than forty hours a week (when German workers were working double that time and more). We shook our heads when we read about these things in the papers. We were indignant when the crises in Austria and Czechoslovakia disturbed our morning coffee. We thought these were isolated apparitions, individual peaks, yet they were all peaks of the same mountain chain. And the mountain was called: revolution. There was system in the madness. And we refused to recognize it.

This ostrich policy is dangerous. It is essential to face facts. For only diseases which are properly diagnosed can be adequately treated. There is always a chance of converting *revolution* into *evolution* before the revolution reaches a new country (where the revolution already prevails there is no chance to convert it any more and it must spend its force), but such a conversion is possible only if you discover in time that the revolution threatens your existence and that you have to take measures to counteract it. We saw the *Blitzkrieg*, but we did not discover that this was also a *Blitz* attack on democracy. And such a *Blitz* attack can be answered only with a *Blitz* defence.

For America, the revolution is yet on the other side of the Atlantic. And on the other side of the Pacific. Yet democracy and an individualist way of life are being seriously challenged. The waves are beginning to assail the rocks of the American coast. We all realize that the democratic system of government is far better, more just, and more propitious than autocracy, authoritarian régime, dictatorship, or totalitarianism. But at the same time there is no doubt that the democratic system must adapt itself to new conditions if it wants to survive. Old-fashioned

democracy is ideal in peace-time. But where are the days of peace? Where are the golden days of our fathers and grandfathers, whose only care was to complete their daily work, to save some money which they could invest with ninety-eight per cent certainty? They could amuse themselves, play games, and then go to sleep, without taking a sleeping powder. . . .

The World War of 1914-18 badly disturbed this peaceful existence. France, England, and later the United States had to adopt measures which converted them into almost dictatorially ruled countries. Nominally a parliamentary control was maintained; yet for all practical purposes the form of rule adopted in the three major democratic countries during the World War was authoritarian.

War, a major calamity, has developed in our days into a life-and-death struggle. In the old days, emperors, kings, and princes could embark on private wars which were often just expeditions for loot. But since the birth of conscript armies war has become a grim struggle for the very existence of the countries involved. Just because war concerns nowadays the survival of a country, or of a nation, the rulers of the threatened country must oppose the force of the enemy with an organization at least equal to that of their opponents. In this regard democracies are greatly handicapped.

Because totalitarian nations organize their forces with utmost efficiency, the democratic countries must strive to meet their adversaries with the same weapons. Our minds move slowly, and democratic mentality can be changed only slowly. But if the enemy is quick, the democracies must be quick, too!

Prevention is still the best cure. But democracies can afford only with great difficulty to introduce preventive

## WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE COLLAPSE?

cures. For this reason they must pay dearly if war or revolution knocks at their doors. Take the example of England! Great Britain was certainly the most liberal and most parliamentary country in Europe before the outbreak of the 1939 war. Today she is a sterner autocracy than she was in the last war. She had no choice. Great Britain, as a typical democracy, adopted this attitude only to meet the war emergency, and adopted it too late. She should have adopted conscription much earlier—conscription is a truly democratic idea—and she should have established national unity much earlier. People were afraid of the Labour Party, when the real enemy, the revolution and world war, was already knocking at the gates.

“When ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it is. And when ye see the south wind blow, ye say, There will be heat; and it cometh to pass.

“Ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time?”

One could ask the same question with the New Testament. Do people not see the signs of the times? Before the World War, most European countries, with the exception of Russia and Turkey, had much the same Governments—semi-democratic, democratic, or pseudo-democratic. But after the war, those countries whose democracy was of younger origin, and whose democratic and parliamentary system struck no sufficiently deep roots, discarded the democratic system and adopted new forms of authoritarian, semi-authoritarian, or totalitarian rules which threatened to rend the world into two camps. There was a division between victors and defeated, between satisfied and dissatisfied nations, between “haves” and “have-nots.”

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

The victors and the "satisfied" were one group, but not so the defeated and the "dissatisfied," because Italy belonged to the victors, but she was not a satisfied nation. The victors and satisfied nations, however, clung to the long-inherited democratic and parliamentary system of their fathers.

Everybody took it for granted prior to 1914 that war breeds revolutions. And yet, while everybody knew this axiom, nobody wanted to see that with the collapse of imperial Russia in 1917 and with the defeat of the Central Powers in 1918 a new period of revolution had begun. Defeat brings misery, and misery creates dissatisfaction. And dissatisfaction is already the first stage of the revolution.

Most of us were aware that there was a revolution marching on after the war of 1914-18. But we identified this revolution with the Bolshevik régime in Russia. Naturally the Soviet régime was part and parcel of the revolution. But it was not the whole of the revolution. Only part of it.

Fascism and Naziism were counter-revolutionary apparitions, and people did not realize that counter-revolutions may be part of a wider revolutionary process. The possessing classes in the world believed that Fascism and Naziism were bulwarks against Communism. The rich had mistaken the counter-revolution for reaction. But Fascism and Naziism were not reactionary. Herr Thyssen had to learn this at a very high expense. So did the Comité des Forges in France. . . . The awakening, however, came too late. And because people awakened too late, the world is very sick at present.

## Chapter 9

### ORIGINS OF THE REVOLUTION

THE revolution which at present is sweeping over Europe is not a product of our own age, though it has arrived rather suddenly and surprisingly amongst us. The chain which led to it is probably a very long one; but the real father of the revolution of our days is the French Revolution. Which has not yet been finished. Now a symphony may remain "unfinished," but not a revolution.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the French philosopher, was the first to revive the democratic idea, which had been dead and buried for almost two thousand years—since its Greek days. In his book, *Le Contrat Social*,<sup>1</sup> he tried to construct for mankind a sort of salvation plan on a basis of equality and justice. He advocated that those in power should renounce their might in favour of the people as a whole, creating an unchallengeable, indivisible, popular sovereignty functioning as the general will.

Rousseau's ideas vitally influenced the spirit of the times just when a colony of English (and some Dutch) settlers were struggling for more righteous treatment from the English Crown. The wind of liberty and equality as heralded by Rousseau's books now deeply affected these American colonists; their dissatisfaction grew to rebellion.

If Jean-Jacques Rousseau, together with Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Diderot, influenced the colonists of the New

<sup>1</sup> *The Social Contract*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

World to strive for liberty, the American Declaration of Independence, the result of this revolt, and the whole Jeffersonian mentality in turn influenced the French thinkers. And lo! in the wake of the American revolution came the French Revolution of 1789.

France had no parliament like England, only a representative assembly called the States-General, in which the various estates, or classes, were represented. The Third Estate, that is, the commons, represented the lower middle class, lower clergy, and artisans. But the States-General was never summoned; the Third Estate, which was obliged to carry the greater part of the tax burden, without having any means to protest or veto the commands of the Government, grew increasingly dissatisfied, a feeling which ultimately expressed itself in revolution.

The French Revolution, especially in its later stages, already showed real Bolshevik and Communist tendencies, differing little from principles which were to appear in the Russian or Italian or German revolutions of our day. The Jacobins, whose rule of terror from 1793 on horrified the nobles as well as many of their own former supporters, were the extreme radicals; the Girondins were the more conservative element. But even more radical than the Jacobins were the Cordeliers—the torch-bearers of the worst terror. Liberty was the byword of the extremists, but, as in many revolutions, it really spelt terror.

The spectacular years of the Jacobin and Sansculotte terror are better remembered than any of its achievements; but basically the revolution of 1789, and even its later terror phase, formed a momentous movement for the liberation of the Third Estate, the bourgeoisie. This movement, which terrified our fathers and grandfathers, finally



## ORIGINS OF THE REVOLUTION

liberated the class to which most of us belong, which today is fighting for its existence just as the aristocrats fought a hundred and fifty years ago for their lives, for their property, for their very existence.

I do not wish to say that what is happening now in Russia, Germany, and Italy is not an important economic upheaval. But I do want to assert—and I shall explain it fully in later chapters—that economically nothing definite has been achieved by the revolutions. It is certain that the capitalist system was bad, but no real and acceptable substitute has yet been offered. Nor are there any signs of such substitutes in the future. If Germany should win this war, we should probably have to live under new economic conditions based virtually on slave labour; for this very reason I do not believe in their survival. The transition which will fill out the period between the collapse of present-day capitalism, if Germany should win, and the unknown future new economy I consider to be only a makeshift.

This new revolution is the continuation of the great equalizing process which the French Revolution wanted. The Third Estate did not include all who were below the aristocrats and the high clergy. The lowest bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the workers remained pariahs even after the ultimate triumph of the principles of the revolution. Politically they became equal in most countries in Europe but not socially. The social chasm between the higher bourgeoisie and these lowest classes remained greater than was the cleavage between the aristocrats and the Third Estate. The first and immediate result of the present revolution, signs of which are already visible in the countries which it affects, will be the liberation of the Fourth Estate.

In other aspects also the French Revolution can be

regarded as the forerunner of the revolution of our days. War begets revolution, as I have said. It was the oppressive high taxes necessitated by the wars of Louis XVI that brought about the revolution. In turn, revolution begets war. Hardly was the revolution running the third year of its course when a group of revolutionists wished to spread it by the sword! Revolutions are always expansive. France had already annexed Avignon, and in 1792, on April 20 (a day on which ninety-seven years later Adolf Hitler was to be born), she declared war on Austria. Thus the French Revolution started its victorious war all over Europe.

The Girondists and the Jacobins hoped that war would help sweep the Bourbons from France's throne; the mob hoped that it would help liberate its downtrodden comrades abroad. Only the extremists, like Robespierre and Marat, opposed war; they realized clearly that it would bring about the establishment of military dictatorships. This was indeed so; it was as a result of the war that Napoleon started his phenomenal career.

I want to recall this phase of the French Revolution to my readers, because, as subsequent chapters will show, the Marats and Robespierres of our time have carefully studied this lesson. Certain courses taken by the present revolution and wars can be explained only by the fact that both Lenin and Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini learned the lessons of 1792. That is why in the first years of the Bolshevik revolution Lenin refused to embark on wars, though Trotsky had already built up a strong Red army; that is why Stalin executed the eight marshals in 1937; that is the reason for the purge of February 4, 1938, in the German army when General von Fritsch was ousted.

Napoleon snatched away success from the extreme

## ORIGINS OF THE REVOLUTION

revolutionaries, and though his régime was described as a counter-revolutionary one, it was still the spirit of the revolution that helped the victorious march of the French armies everywhere. With the defeat of Waterloo the revolution was not yet dead; the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 show that it was only driven underground.

France spilled much valuable blood during her long period of revolution; many valuable lives and much property were lost, and now England skimmed the cream; learned, without bloodshed, the lessons of the revolution, and developed a school of thought which not only brought peace and prosperity to the British Isles for a long period, but was borrowed by all European countries, thankful or envious. And even the United States and France, the two countries which had to pay with a heavy sacrifice of blood for the democratic institutions that they now established, had to borrow from England many ideas.

This new school of thought, known as the Manchester *laissez-faire* school, dominated the life of the civilized world for at least three-quarters of a century. It was born in opposition to French mercantilism and to various paternal measures adopted by the State; its prophets were Jeremy Bentham, with his utilitarian philosophy, and John Stuart Mill, with his liberal principles, while the banner-bearers were Richard Cobden and John Bright. Partly based on researches of earlier economists and political philosophers, it derived mainly from the lessons of the French Revolution, and contained all the essential elements of justice, rights, and progressive ideas with which the Declaration of Independence of the United States and the Rights of Man of the French Revolution were originally imbued.

But there is no action that does not produce its reaction

very soon. And so it happened that both the political ideas and the economic principles of the liberal school were challenged. The reasons were manifold. The result of the French Revolution was that the Third Estate, the bourgeoisie, now took its place on the side of the former classes, and not only became their equal, but embarked on a financial and economic prosperity which aroused the envy both of those who suffered from the revolution and of those who belonged to the lowest strata of the population, especially the workers.

The nice-sounding Communist ideas of some apostles of the French Revolution were soon forgotten. The newly enfranchised bourgeoisie, in its youthful strength and energy, produced an incredible economic progress in Europe. This class profited not only by the French Revolution but by the Industrial Revolution, in the vanguard of which was England, the country which had been able to keep outside the revolutionary wave.

This Industrial Revolution began actually before the other revolutionary wave could unfold its power. The second half of the eighteenth century saw the development of many epoch-making inventions such as the steam engine, the spinning jenny, the water-power spinning frame, the mule, and the power loom. The banner-bearers of the industrial development at the beginning of the nineteenth century represented the class which obtained political and economic liberation through the ideas of the French Revolution. But their phenomenal success was attained at a terrible price; the workers, including many women and children, who ran the machines in these new industrial undertakings became the victims of a slavery such as these newly-liberated classes had never experienced even in the

darkest period of their oppression. Thus, since it achieved liberation for one class only, and brought another class into a still worse slavery, the enfranchisement of the Third Estate already carried within itself the germs of a new unrest.

The new fight was twofold: political and economic. Politically the oppressed classes achieved success in the country of the worst oppression, England, by attaining parliamentary reform which slowly brought about the enfranchisement of the "Fourth Estate" all over Europe. But economically their lot did not improve; and revolt was abroad amongst the economically dissatisfied.

The 1830 revolution in France and the neighbouring countries brought new hope to the masses. Two Frenchmen in particular were now preaching revolutionary doctrines for the liberation of the working classes: Robert Auguste Blanqui and Louis Blanc. The latter, influenced by Fourier's and Saint-Simon's "romantic socialism," preached the nationalization of property and the creation of social workshops; Blanqui was more radical and revolutionary, and his activities had a deep influence on another young revolutionary, the German-Jewish Karl Marx.

All three played important parts, at different places, in the revolution of 1848. But it was Karl Marx whose influence was most lasting and whose theories have stamped their impression on our age. His *Communist Manifesto*, written with Friedrich Engels and issued in 1848, decisively influenced the labour movements of Europe for seven consecutive decades. His masters were two German thinkers, George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, whose dialectics captured Marx's imagination, and Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach, who abandoned Hegel's absolute idealism, preached

naturalistic materialism, and attacked the orthodox religions.

Marxian ideology was started as an opposition to unbounded individualism and unrestricted liberal *laissez-faire*. Marx taught the economic interpretation of history, namely, that economic conditions determine the course of events. He believed that the dispossessed proletariat will ultimately be the heir of capitalist society, because the capitalist system is driving more and more people into slavery, while through the foundation of trusts and huge combines the possessors will always be fewer. In his earlier days, Marx was international and revolutionary; he thought to attain the dispossession of the propertied classes by revolutionary means; but later on he developed the theory that the rapid growth of trusts will reduce the number of property-owners to such a small number that the fruits may fall into the lap of the proletariat without much struggle. The masses need only wait patiently, and they will inherit the earth.

Following this later stage of Marx's thought, German pupils of his, and especially Eduard Bernstein, converted Socialism into a non-revolutionary movement. Most of the European Socialist parties became Social-Democratic, hoping to achieve their aims by constitutional and parliamentary methods.

This, however, created opposition in countries where temperaments were more eruptive than in the German and Anglo-Saxon countries. In Russia the Social-Democratic movement broke into a radical group, the Bolsheviki, and a more moderate one, the Mensheviki. In Ireland, James Larkin's Sinn Fein-sympathizing movement represented the extremists.

## ORIGINS OF THE REVOLUTION

More important, however, was the revolt of the extremist trade or labour unions in the Latin countries. Influenced by Pierre Joseph Proudhon, the anarchist, who called the State the great oppressor, and wanted to give power to small, loosely federated economic groups, the labour unionists in France developed a movement which was a revolt against modern society as well as against Marxism. This group, who called themselves syndicalists, intended ultimately to obtain the ownership of all industrial and transport properties for the workers in the respective unions. But the movement had a larger aspect; it was a revolt against the more evolutionary development of Marxism.

The Social Democrats who participated in the Second, or Brussels, International were democratic and parliamentary; they courted the masses, had a great respect for the majority, and advocated equalitarianism. They followed the later teachings of Marx in believing that power will fall into the hands of the proletariat without a struggle. The syndicalists, on the other hand, represented a kind of split within the party; they asserted that the Social Democrats falsified the teachings of the master. For the masses, they had a Nietzschean contempt, which the syndicalist Brouilhet thus expressed: "The masses expect to be treated with contempt and violence and they do not expect to be persuaded. They always follow obediently if a single man or a clique shows them what to do. Such is the law of collective psychology."

The father of the syndicalist movement  
Pelloutier; its prophet Georges Sorel. In  
*Violence*,<sup>1</sup> published in 1906, Sorel taught

<sup>1</sup> London: George Allen & Unwin/

letariat must fight if it wishes to inherit the earth. But the majority itself cannot act; only a determined minority ready to fight or to organize strikes, can bring down the columns of the capitalist temple.

These ideas of Sorel's were not only the basis of Bolshevik action in Russia, but were employed in Italy by Mussolini, a devout pupil of Sorel. And the Fascist part of the National Socialist programme in Germany was learned in Italy. Thus Sorel, the drunken engineer who used to consume so many absinthes at the Closerie de Lilas in Montparnasse, became the woe-bringing prophet of our revolutionary period, as Jean-Jacques Rousseau was the herald of the French Revolution.

I used to meet Sorel repeatedly in Paris before the World War. Not far from the Closerie des Lilas a Russian called Vladimir Ilyitch Ulyanoff, better known under his assumed name of Nicolas Lenin, was living in exile. For a short time I lived in the house which harboured the studio of Lenin. And at nightfall I used to walk over to the Closerie des Lilas, where Sorel was explaining in his loud voice the technique of the revolution of the future.

I never realized that I was living so near to world history. Sorel died in 1922, Lenin in 1924, but their ideas are still alive. Much too alive—even if not in the forms they dreamt of and wished.



## Chapter 10

### THE ISMS INTERCONNECTED

WE have said that all three totalitarian movements: anti-mass, revolutionary, and authoritarian, were children of similar ideas derived from the syndicalist wing of Marxian Socialism, and expressed by Sorel. Let us examine these three revolutions and see how close is their real relationship.

The Swiss professor Seipel and the American writer Lothrop Stoddard in 1921 asserted that the Bolshevik movement was entirely syndicalistic and that it put into practice what the syndicalists had preached. This is not quite correct. The substance of Bolshevism is not Sorelian; Lenin and Trotsky were opposed to the syndicalist principles. Nevertheless, they came in contact with the syndicalist prophets through Russian friends interested in this movement; and when in November, 1917, these two Russian leaders made the Bolshevik revolution, they followed the Sorelian doctrine of the direct action of a minority.

Mussolini's connection was still closer; he belonged to the syndicalist wing of the Italian Socialists. Sorel's *Reflections on Violence* was originally written in article form for the Italian syndicalist review *Il Divenire Sociale*. As the Bolsheviks have for many years concentrated their chief attacks on Social Democracy, the syndicalists were developing a decided hatred against the "timid and pacifistic" Social-Democratic leaders; Sorel constantly attacked Jean

Jaurès, the great French Socialist. In this syndicalist school, Mussolini learned, first, to hate the Social-Democratic pacifist and non-aggressive policy; second, to hate the masses; third, to loathe parliamentary procedures; and fourth, to preach that only a small but determined minority is able to carry through, with the aid of violence, the aims for which it stands. Margareta Sarfatti, in her authorized biography of Mussolini, states that the Duce admitted that his two masters were Nietzsche and Sorel. Since 1914, his entire activity has been based on Sorelian principles.

But we must see how the German National Socialist movement, at present the most vigorous and triumphant amongst the three totalitarian movements, is connected with the other two.

German National Socialism, usually now associated with the name of Adolf Hitler, is in reality a movement which existed in German-speaking countries long before this leader of the present movement joined it. Its roots go back as far as 1903, when an engineer, called Rudolf Jung, and a young attorney, Doctor Walther Riehl, founded a German Workers' Party, as a revolt against the internationalism of the existing Social-Democratic movement in Austria. Not only was this new party non-Marxian and non-internationalist; it was also intensely antisemitic, nationalistic, and pan-German; that is, in favour of the union of the German provinces and population of Austria with the Second German Reich. Doctor Riehl himself was a Social Democrat, but he belonged to the pan-German wing of the Social-Democratic Party, led by Engelbert Pernersdorfer, and was deeply influenced by its philosophy. The progress of this German Workers' Party in old Austria was slow; but its ideas survived. In 1917, it adopted the

name Deutsche Nationalsozialistische Arbeiter Partei, using the initials D.N.S.A.P. By 1918, it had several deputies in the Austrian Reichsrat. When defeat in the World War caused the break-up of Austria-Hungary, the National Socialist Party also split into an Austrian and a Czechoslovakian wing. The largest faction was in the Sudeten lands, which now became part of the new Czechoslovak Republic. In Munich, not too distant from the Sudeten lands, a group, dissatisfied by the Jewish-led Bavarian Socialist movement, founded a National Socialist Party on the pattern of the Austrian predecessor. In 1918 Adolf Hitler became "drummer" of this movement. It was under his influence that the Bavarian party adopted the name similar to the former Austrian movement: Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter Partei—N.S.D.A.P.!

Since 1920 the three National Socialist movements in Bavaria, Austria, and Czechoslovakia have closely co-operated; an inter-party committee was established which had frequent meetings. The chairman of this committee was the founder of the movement, Doctor Walther Riehl; the German representative from Munich was Adolf Hitler. This co-operation existed until August, 1923, when Hitler and Riehl disagreed about methods to be adopted in the future. Should the National Socialists go into the elections and contest their power at the polls, or should they attain power by revolution? Doctor Riehl was still for parliamentary procedure. Adolf Hitler, however, by this time fascinated by the progress of Italian Fascism, preferred the Sorelian principle of obtaining power by the violence of a determined minority. He did not know the writings of Sorel (though his propaganda chief, Doctor Paul Josef Goebbels, did), but he was impressed by Mussolini's

march on Rome—the culmination of such Sorelian action. So he decided to attain power by force, through the means of a *coup d'état*; and the *Putsch* of November 9, 1923, in Munich followed. It was unsuccessful. But Hitler was now in the grip of two ideas: first, German National Socialism—anti-Marxian, though of Marxian origin, antisemitic and nationalist; and second, Fascism, accepted as method and form of rule, should National Socialism be able to obtain power in Germany.

We have seen that Marxism begat its own critic in Sorel's syndicalism and Lenin's revolutionary Socialism, and with Sorel's direct-action methods the revolutionary Bolsheviki obtained power in Moscow and the former syndicalist Socialist Mussolini in Rome. Negation of Marxian international Socialism begat the Austrian National Socialist movement of which the German National Socialist Party, founded in Munich, became the most powerful branch. With ideas borrowed from Sorel-influenced Fascism, National Socialism started its conquering progress in Germany. Thus, even if they professed for some time to war against each other, all three movements were fundamentally so closely related that they were bound to meet each other in their course of development.

Still another bond between the three revolutions is the fact that their leaders were poor men. When Stalin forced Trotsky into exile, I visited the Café Central in Vienna, where Trotsky used to go during his earlier exile before the outbreak of the World War. The head waiter told me how the Russian revolutionary used to play chess in that café with the psychoanalysts Doctor Alfred Adler and Doctor Kaplan. He said that Trotsky's money often ran

out, and then for some weeks he would consume his coffees in the Central on credit.

"Just before he left Vienna—very hurriedly, when the war broke out in 1914—he was without money, and he left debts with me amounting to ten kronen. I always thought that Herr Trotsky, as people's commissar and leader of the Red army, would remember this debt, but now that he is going into exile again, I suppose I must write it off. . . ." I quote this conversation to show that Trotsky was very poor.

Lenin was very poor when he lived in exile, both in Paris and Geneva. His Paris studio was the famous asylum for all newly arrived Russian refugees, and the modest room, not larger than ten by ten feet, often harboured as many as a dozen refugees. Poverty, need, suffering, and want were at home in Lenin's abodes in exile. Stalin lived under very poor conditions, right up to his rise to power. Mussolini's youth was spent in utmost poverty in Predapio or Forlì Pratense. The son of the village blacksmith got more beatings than bread. And his need became even greater when he grew older, and was often imprisoned, when he lived in exile in Lausanne or Geneva, or when he was editor of a small Socialist paper in Trento (Trient) then in Austria. Hitler grew up in Leonding, Upper Austria, under miserable circumstances. His father, a retired customs official, lived on his modest pension, and young Hitler knew little of the amenities of life. His days in Vienna must have been even harder, though nothing positive is known about them.

It is important not to overlook the fact that most revolutionary leaders of our age are from this lowest stratum of the population. This circumstance has made them the

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

champions of the poor and socially ostracized classes. For this reason, one should not smile if the totalitarian dictators speak of the co-operation of the "have-nots" or, as they recently do, of the proletarian States. The common origin of the movements and the common fate shared in youth by the leaders have, even if unconsciously, proven to be strong ties.

Poor "appeasers" in the England and France of the fall of 1938! They believed in the Anti-Comintern Pact, they believed that Germany could be used as bulwark against what they considered the most dangerous revolutionary force, Bolshevism. Not realizing that these three totalitarian régimes were children of similar ideas, they overlooked the danger of the most virulent of them, and revolutionary German National Socialism achieved its victory over France.

## Chapter II

### RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONS

LET us now trace the course by which these three revolutions have come together. Italy and Germany had, to begin with, the additional tie of common ideologies. Fascism and National Socialism were revolutions—or as many call them, counter-revolutions—with the same aims and principles. Both Hitler and Mussolini realized that if the one were defeated by the democratic countries, the other would hardly be able to survive as an authoritarian country. Personally the two dictators took a spontaneous and sincere dislike to each other. Obviously! Two *prima donnas* never like each other, and both leaders instinctively felt that the rise to great fame of the one was bound to overshadow the other. Mussolini considered himself the creator of a new doctrine which was to influence the countries of the world, and now Hitler in Germany was beginning to outshine him. This was unpleasant.

When the two dictators met in Venice in the spring of 1934 for the first time, Mussolini, in a loud voice, within the hearing of the diplomats and, what is more important, the German journalists, said to the secretary of the Fascist Party, Achille Starace, "*Starace, lui mi non piace*" (Starace, I don't like him). In Italian the words rhyme.

Yet two clever men, like Hitler and Mussolini, soon realized that until democracy is defeated their régimes are

bound together. When during the sanctions period in 1936 Italy was in danger of being forced to her knees, Hitler, despite his former opposition to her (which had frustrated his *coup d'état* in Austria in July, 1934), supported Mussolini, thus probably saving Rome from further humiliation, though less than a year before the latter had still been willing to co-operate with the democracies in the Stresa front. Ever since the sanctions period the two countries have been bound together by friendship. This friendship naturally would reach its limits if the European democracies suffered a final defeat.

Russo-German relations were not as clear as that. The final attainment of collaboration took a fairly long time. (How long this collaboration will last is another question!) The distrust between Hitler and Stalin was even greater than that between Mussolini and Hitler. One has only to read the philippics against Bolshevism in *Mein Kampf* to obtain an idea of the feelings Hitler entertained toward the Soviets. Ever since 1933, when the National Socialist régime came into power, the tenor of the German Press has been: "Bolshevism is the greatest danger to European civilization; there will be no peace and order in Europe so long as the well-poisoners of Moscow can continue their dark machinations all over the world." Doctor Joseph Goebbels's propaganda ministry, and especially Alfred Rosenberg's *Voelkischer Beobachter*, invited the entire world to unite against these dangerous enemies of European society. But those who took the German threats against the Soviets at their face value, or who believed that Germany and Soviet Russia were finally divided into two different ideological camps, misunderstood the whole nature and development of the German Nazi revolution.



Goebbels's newspapers might shout against Soviet Russia, and the Moscow *Pravda* and *Isvestija* might thunder against the Fascist exploiters, yet not only did both Hitler and Stalin for a long time entertain a hope of co-operation, but the ideological bases of the Russian and the German revolutions were coming nearer each day. Only those who did not want to see things were doubtful about this necessary development in revolutionary history.

Stalin used to say to his friends a long, long time ago: "Let Hitler alone. He is the best short cut to a proletarian revolution in Germany." And Stalin's ideas were crystallized in the resolution of the Praesidium of the Comintern in 1934, which solemnly declared that the Nationalist Socialist dictatorship in Germany had accelerated enormously "the rate of Germany's development toward proletarian revolution by destroying all the democratic illusions of the masses and liberating them from the influence of Social Democracy."

Moreover, Stalin and Hitler had enemies in common. Stalin always saw the greatest enemy of his régime in the capitalistic Powers of Western Europe. And they were the Powers of Versailles! Hitler, again, despite his violent anti-Communist outbursts, was in revolt against Versailles! Here was the beginning of a possible platform!

In my book *South of Hitler*,<sup>1</sup> I devote a whole chapter to the prediction of a future Russo-German alliance or co-operation. I said amongst other things:

"In Central Europe many people believe that the natural development of the Russian system must be a kind of National Socialism, Russian Nationalist, but truly socialistic. If Russia, in a decade or so, or perhaps much earlier,

<sup>1</sup> London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

reaches a stage of National Socialism, will there be a natural inclination of the two powerful régimes of similar constitution in Germany and Russia to co-operate? . . . Many augurs, with the safe instinct of illogical people, see the spectre of this German-Russian friendship looming on the horizon."

I wrote those words in the spring of 1937 and they were published in November of the same year. Most of my friends thought my predictions fantastic, but I knew that I was right.

Furthermore, there was a historical tradition of Russo-German collaboration which worked toward a Nazi-Soviet *rapprochement*. Germany's Iron Chancellor, Prince Otto von Bismarck, was always a protagonist of Russo-German co-operation. This orientation failed only because Bismarck considered that in the interest of consolidating his newly founded Second German Reich it was essential to have an alliance with Austria-Hungary, and the traditional hatred between Austria and Russia, occasioned by a clash of interest in the Balkans, proved to be a final stumbling-block. But the Bismarckian dreams have strongly influenced Germany's political thinkers and statesmen.

There was another unofficial act of German-Russian co-operation in 1917. Though the two countries were at war, the German general staff, with the consent of General Erich von Ludendorff, smuggled Lenin and Trotsky in a sealed wagon from Zürich into Russia via Germany. At that time Ludendorff's Germany co-operated with the Russian Bolsheviks.

I have to admit that Erich von Ludendorff, this sinister figure of the last wartime and post-war period of Germany, was by no means a reactionary, as many thought. He was a

revolutionary. When I visited him with an English colleague of mine, John G. Hamilton, of the *Manchester Guardian*, he broke into hysterical abuse of the democrats.

"I respect the Socialists," he said. "I may hate them, but they are fighting for their own class. But you, the liberals and democrats, are just meddling in everything, claiming to do so for high moral principles. I hate your paper and your liberals more than I hate anything in this world," he concluded, speaking with great passion.

Five years after the Ludendorff intermezzo, Germany and Soviet Russia surprised the world by signing a treaty of non-aggression and friendship in Rapallo, Italy, at the time of the Genoa conference. Both countries were considered outside the orbit of the "decent" nations; Germany, because the Versailles Treaty stamped her as the aggressor of the last war; Russia, because she had repudiated her debts and confiscated the property of the former possessing classes. But while the other countries were discussing other European problems, the two outlaw countries clandestinely arranged meetings which resulted in this Treaty of Rapallo, the first step in recognizing the Russian régime, at least *de jure*. The former Russian people's commissar Tsitserin, who died in the gutter as a drunken outcast some years later, and the German Foreign Minister, Walter Rathenau, who was killed in the same year by National Socialist assassins, were responsible for the signing of this treaty.

While the Rapallo Treaty was avowedly only a political and economic arrangement, there existed a secret military agreement between the two countries which was chiefly due to the efforts of the arch-Conservative Reichswehr officer, General von Seeckt. The Versailles Treaty prohibited the establishment of a strong air force and tank

corps in the German army. To circumvent these provisions General von Seeckt made arrangements by which Russia manufactured and stored secret weapons for the use of the German "Black" (secret) Reichswehr. The Germans, in turn, became the instructors of the Russian military schools, or at least they helped to organize the Russian officers' schools and the Soviet general staff. This co-operation between the armies, which was a revolt against the Versailles Powers, has left a much deeper mark in the two than most people suspect. The official co-operation between the Red army and the Reichswehr lasted until the coming to power of the National Socialists in January, 1933. But it would be a mistake to believe that it came to an end then; it continued, even if clandestinely. When the Red Marshal Uborevitch was invited by General von Blomberg to the big manoeuvres in Germany, after the Nuremberg Party Congress in 1936, he was not only received most cordially by Blomberg and his generals, but was treated with distinctive courtesy. Thus the generals showed Uborevitch some of Germany's secret aeroplanes and tanks, which they refused to show even to the friendly Italian delegation.

It was not only the Bismarckian tradition that helped the *rapprochement* between the two armies; it was the eternal Polish question. Uborevitch and some of the other marshals were White Russians (not ideologically, but geographically, and ethnographically), and could easily find a common platform with the German army on a basis of the division of Poland. Outwardly, relations between Soviet Russia and Hitlerite Germany became extremely strained. Herr Joachim von Ribbentrop, Germany's Foreign Minister, invited all "decent" foreign Powers to unite in an anti-Comintern pact. These German efforts temporarily cooled Stalin's

enthusiasm for the Hitlerite régime, and led him to effect a truce with the democracies; in May, 1935, he made military alliances with both France and Czechoslovakia. Germany and Italy, and later Japan, signed the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1936. Hungary, Jugoslavia, Greece, and a number of other countries were completely in sympathy with these endeavours to carry on an ideological fight against Russia, and the two great Western European democracies, while unwilling to join such a pact, were more than pleased. Germany was amply compensated for her services as "dam against the Bolshevik flood" by being permitted to rearm, to occupy the Rhineland, and to capture Austria and Czechoslovakia.

This situation became even more emphasized when on July 17, 1936, Francisco Franco started his counter-revolution in Spain. The Franco revolt seemed to establish clearly the lines of cleavage between what most people thought of as two ideologies. On the one side was Bolshevik Russia, supported by the French Popular Front, as well as by all the "pinks" and "three-quarter Reds" in the democratic countries; on the other side were the Powers of the Anti-Comintern Pact, Japan, Germany, and Italy, supported openly by Salazar's Portugal, the Governments of Hungary, Greece, Jugoslavia, among others, and arousing the sympathies of the middle classes, especially of the possessing classes, in Britain, France, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and many other democratic countries.

Furthermore, it was on the charge of having conspired with the enemies of the proletariat, the German Nazis, that Tuchatchevsky and eight other Russian marshals were executed in 1937. Undoubtedly they had conspired; but did not Stalin have the same aim? Probably he had other

reasons for executing Tuchatchevsky. He had never forgiven him for accusing him of having robbed the revolutionary armies in 1918 and 1920 of the chance of a complete victory.

When in July, 1918, the Denikin armies were fighting the forces of Klementi Voroshiloff near Tsaritsyn (now Stalingrad), Josef Stalin was acting as political commissar with a view to requisitioning foodstuffs in the district and to restoring order. He organized a special Cheka (terror police) to bend the population into obedience. Trotsky was trying to collect the loose fighting remnants of the Red army into a unified force, but both Voroshiloff and Stalin sabotaged all his endeavours. When Trotsky had to decide to evacuate Tsaritsyn to fight the Whites and the Czechs elsewhere, all his instructions were disregarded, which ended in a Red defeat at Simbirski. Years later Marshal Tuchatchevsky, then head of the War Academy in Moscow, estimated that the disobeying of the orders of Trotsky at Tsaritsyn caused the prolongation of the civil war by two years. Tuchatchevsky also declared that Stalin, with Voroshiloff and Yegoroff, had disobeyed Trotsky's plan for the capture of Warsaw, in order to enhance his own prestige by the capture of Lemberg. It was because of these accusations, and because of Stalin's fear that Tuchatchevsky might strive for a military dictatorship, because he wanted to co-operate with Germany, that he and his marshals had to die.

Even in this period of open hostilities with Nazi Germany, even when he was executing many Bolshevik leaders on charges of conspiring with Germany, Stalin himself certainly continued to issue feelers to the Nazis. We know from the revelations of Walter Krivitzky, a former high

official of the Russian military intelligence, that despite all Germany had done for the Anti-Comintern, he pleaded, "We have to reach an understanding with the Germans." This Stalin declared before the Politburo at a time when the Franco-Russian military pact was to be signed. In fact, he regarded the *rapprochement* with France as a kind of pressure or blackmail on Germany, and hoped through it to obtain better terms in his ultimate agreement with Hitler.

Fräulein Elisabeth Knaust, formerly an important employee of the propaganda ministry of Doctor Goebbels, revealed in an American magazine in February, 1940, that Doctor Goebbels, with the consent of high military and Nazi supporters, worked for years to bring about a Russo-German agreement.

Hermann Rauschning, the former president of the Danzig Senate, and formerly a rabid Nazi, disclosed in his writings that Hitler himself always shaped his policy with the idea that he could go either against or with Russia. Even when he was thundering at the Bolsheviks, he had in mind possible co-operation with Russia in opposition to the Versailles Powers.

Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia crossed weapons, or apparently crossed them, in the Spanish and Czechoslovak crises. The Spanish civil war was a suitable trying-out of the new weapons to be used in the future war; but the Germans, fighting on Franco's side, never regarded the Russians, fighting on the loyalist side, as their enemies.

In the Czech crisis the value of a French alliance was tried out. When it was found to be zero, then Russia finally decided to make up her feud with Germany. The question was whether Herr Hitler, whose *Mein Kampf* was

full of anti-Bolshevik utterances, was willing to act as a realist. Yes, this was the great enigma.

Hitler, who goes by intuition and instinct, felt at the Munich conference that sooner or later he would have to fight it out with the Western Powers. He had therefore to make sure that Russia would not attack his flank and thus force him to fight a two-front war, against which all his generals had warned him. Today we know what it meant to them! By avoiding a war on two fronts against major opponents, Germany could restrict her armed forces, at least at the beginning of the war, to about two hundred divisions, or three million men, as against ten million men mobilized in the last war. This time only 4·2 per cent of the population was involved; the last time 15 per cent! This meant that Germany could keep three men in the factories for each man on the front, and with this the question of supply could be solved.

And so, only a few weeks after Munich, Hitler decided to make up his feud with Soviet Russia. On November 16, 1938, I sent a telegram to my paper, the *Chicago Daily News*, in which I declared, on the basis of absolutely reliable information, that Ribbentrop, through the German ambassador in Moscow, Count Alexander von Schulenburg, had offered Stalin a non-aggression pact. My informer, a prominent Czech negotiator who had just come from Berlin, told me that the offer proposed to divide Poland and to make Finland and Estonia Russian spheres of interest, while Latvia and Lithuania remained German.

All my friends disbelieved my report, as they had disbelieved my prediction of future co-operation between Russia and Germany in 1937. The first Russian reactions were not overwhelmingly eager. But this was all comedy.



## RAPPROCHEMENT BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONS

Russia knew that Germany had aims in the West. And for this reason she did not act as if she were overwhelmed by the proposal.

Yet Russia needed Germany badly. For there was still another factor contributing to the bonds of ideology and tradition which were drawing Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany together: Stalin needed Germany's economic help. Russian production of iron and steel was still increasing, but the waste in the armament factories was so great that it swallowed up almost all the steel that Russia produced. And yet Russia had to improve her traffic system and renew her entire industrial machinery, badly worn out by the low abilities of Russian skilled labour and the abuse of machinery through Stakhanoff methods. Only two countries could help her: the United States and Germany. For one reason or another, America was not prepared to give this machinery. Remained therefore Germany.

On her side, too, Germany needed Russian neutrality while she was conducting a major war on the Western front; and she needed Russian raw materials, especially oil, petrol, manganese, and other ores.

The negotiations proceeded slowly. By February, 1939, the German and Russian Press received orders not to attack each other. This was the first sign that the negotiations were taking a favourable turn. By March, 1939, when the nineteenth congress of the Communist Party was held in Moscow, those who read speeches carefully could realize that Russian foreign policy was taking a new course. The subsequent negotiations with the French and English general staff officers in Moscow were only for the purpose of increasing the price of an agreement with Hitler! And

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

indeed, while Germany originally claimed Latvia and Lithuania as her sphere of influence, by July she had to concede these countries to Russia. On August 23, 1939, the German-Russian pact was signed. And one week later the war against Poland began.

## Chapter 12

### CAUSES AND AIMS OF REVOLUTIONS

It was in The Hague in November, 1939. A young Dutch lady, whose brother was a diplomat in Warsaw when the war broke out and who stayed with him during the war, was telling about her experiences. She saw both the German and the Russian occupations in various parts of the country, and the accounts she gave of atrocities on both sides sounded equally horrid.

I asked her whether she would prefer German or Russian occupation if ever her country was in danger of being overpowered by the one or the other totalitarian régime. Her answer was immediate and clear-cut:

“I would prefer the Nazi occupation.”

Although I heard this very same answer from many other Dutch men and Dutch women, I was amazed every time. But the young lady explained why she was thinking this way:

“If the Nazis should occupy our country, then probably our money would become valueless and we might even lose our property. But as I am an Aryan, I very likely should be left alone in any other way. If the Bolsheviks occupy a country, it is not only the property that goes; probably every ‘white-collared’ person would lose his or her life.”

The words of this young Dutch lady, which represent the feeling of the bulk of the middle classes in Europe, are

only conditionally true. But it is characteristic that this belief exists; much as the north-western European democracies were frightened at the spectre of that Nazi invasion which eventually overtook most of them, they preferred it to a possible Bolshevization. Actually, though Bolshevism acts more crudely, quickly, openly, in a true Asiatic fashion which frightens its enemies, while Naziism acts slowly, carefully, the Nazi rule is ultimately just as devastating to the conquered nations as is the Soviet conquest. The only difference is that Soviet rule always spells chaos, while Germany's rule, however high-handed, always brings certain forms of organization.

This fear of Bolshevism has highly benefited Nazi Germany in her propaganda before conquering these various countries, on which she had cast an eye. But today everyone realizes that all three totalitarian régimes in Europe are equally revolutionary in character. At the same time, all European countries are asking two questions: Why did these revolutions come, and, What are their aims?

The difficulties which caused revolution in all three major European totalitarian countries were of similar nature and can be classed in three categories: First, dissatisfaction, brought about in Russia by military exhaustion during the World War; in Italy by a supposedly unjust division of the spoils of victory; and in Germany by military defeat; second, internal political troubles; and third, economic troubles, mostly caused by discrepancy in economic expansion and financial limitations.

The eternal truth that war brings about revolutions, and revolutions beget wars, was clearly demonstrated by the first World War. During the four years of its duration ten million people were killed and its rough total cost was

## CAUSES AND AIMS OF REVOLUTIONS

estimated at the fantastic figure of \$186,000,000,000. The strain imposed on the nerves of both combatants and non-combatants during those four years together with those enormous sacrifices, created unrest, dissatisfaction, and revolutionary movements in every country involved in the war. Naturally when the war came to an end the dissatisfaction received greater impetus in the defeated countries than in the victorious ones. But the "victor" group was also not spared the strain; one need only remember the mutinies in the French armies and dissatisfaction amongst the British troops (*Old soldiers never die; they slowly fade away* was one of their typical songs) to realize that the victors were also at the brink of exhaustion and revolt. Another country, belonging to the "victorious" group, could not even survive until the victory. News of defeat at the front, the occupation of important provinces by German and Austrian troops, continuous new taxes levied on the poorer classes, and reports of huge losses in battle brought about the collapse of Tsarist Russia in March, 1917. This collapse gave the signal for the new revolution—or rather, brought to life the slumbering old one.

Germany and the Central Powers suffered a final defeat in October, 1918, and in consequence revolutions broke out in Bulgaria, Turkey, Hungary, Austria, and Germany. These revolutions swept away the old régimes in practically all countries. But presently the tide of the revolution seemed to have been dammed, and the victors believed that it had been driven into parliamentary or evolutionary channels. Yet the truth was that the revolution in Germany and in Central Europe had just gone underground.

Italy, like Russia, belonged to the victorious group of Powers, yet at the Peace Conference she thought herself betrayed. Before she entered the war in May, 1915, she concluded an agreement with France and England in London, according to which, in the event of an Allied victory, she was to obtain not only Trieste and the Trentino (South Tyrol), but also Fiume and Dalmatia as well as important colonial possessions in Africa. This agreement was not kept, chiefly owing to President Wilson's protest. Since the United States was no partner in this London secret treaty, the President felt by no means bound by its provisions. But the denial of Italy's "legitimate" aims caused Italy to class herself as a "dissatisfied" nation, the first step toward revolution!

The second group of the causes of the revolutions was the troubles initiated by domestic affairs. While the United States, Great Britain, and France, as well as some of the Scandinavian and Low Countries, had experience in democracy and parliamentary government, lasting almost a century, or even much longer, the rest of the European countries had only pseudo-democratic or pseudo-parliamentary régimes and the traditions of democratic rule were not sufficiently deeply rooted in them, while in Russia and Turkey no really serious attempt was made to introduce parliamentary régimes. The short-lived Duma in Russia in 1906 and the parliament of the Young Turks in 1908 were only spurious.

Tsarist Russia was already sick to the core when it entered the World War in August, 1914. Unrest and revolt against the absolutistic Tsarist régime had been brewing for a long time. After the defeat in the Russo-Japanese war the revolution had broken out with elemental

force in 1905. The united efforts of the police and the secret police (*Ochrana*) and the brutal Cossacks succeeded in suppressing its flames. However, its sparks existed everywhere. It was still vivid in the memory of the masses and many of its leaders were alive, and contemplated "revenge" either in Arctic exile in Siberia or in self-chosen refuges in Paris, Geneva, or Vienna. Thus cause number one (dissatisfaction through war exhaustion) was now helped by cause number two—internal troubles. The evil influence of the strange monk Rasputin on the Tsar's family increased political dissatisfaction at home in 1916 and led to the assassination of Rasputin. The defeat on the Galician front now hastened the outbreak of the revolution, which came promptly in February, 1917. On March 15 of that year Tsar Nicholas II was deposed, and on November 7 the Bolsheviki assumed power.

In Italy the dissatisfaction caused by the non-observance by the Allies of the provisions of the London secret agreement were augmented by political dissatisfaction at home. Guglielmo Ferrero, the great Italian historian, rightly wrote in 1924:

"Italy is suffering, not because liberalism and democracy are obsolete and dead, but because they are hardly yet born. . . . We in Italy have never known a true and genuine representative system. The democracy which today is on trial was a fraudulent imitation, which cloaked personal dictatorship and the rule of a small clique. . . . The Giolittian dictatorship, for the very reason that it was a falsification of the representative system, has left no successors. . . . But statesmen are not to be improvised. . . ." The simple lines of the great Italian historian explain more eloquently than anything else why a determined man, commanding an

energetic minority, could obtain power in the Italy of Victor Emmanuel III.

Defeated Germany, with her life complicated by a senseless peace treaty which gave ample material for agitation to her enemies at home, faced the difficult job of political reconstruction. Although Germany completely lacked democratic and parliamentary experience, the Weimar Constitution established a régime in which democracy was wider and farther-reaching than in England and the United States. In consequence the construction of the new political parties was monstrous. The Greater German People's Party and the National Liberals, survivors of the older pre-war régime, represented narrow class interests and never were successful. The Social Democrats attempted not to voice the wishes of a section of German public opinion but to represent a class. And while they were allegedly trying to defend "proletarian" interests, the leaders grew definitely bourgeois in their way of life, earning the distinctive name *Bonzen*. The Communists, next to the Socialists one of the strongest factions in the Berlin Reichstag, took their orders from Moscow and thus constituted a State within the State. The same was true of the rapidly growing National Socialist Party, whose members accepted allegiance in the first place to the Fuehrer and only in the second (or third) to the Republic. This pseudo-democracy carried in itself the germs of its own destruction.

Yet dissatisfaction with military reverses or defeats and political complications were only part of the causes which hastened the course of the revolution. One of the fundamental conditions of its coming were the dissatisfactions caused by the economic and financial system of our age.



People used to say even before the first World War, "The capitalist system is rotten to the core and bound to collapse." No system in this world has been perfect and, "hand on the heart" (as the Germans say), capitalism was far from perfection! But has any other system produced better results? Twenty-three years of experiment in Bolshevism, eighteen years of Fascism, and seven years of National Socialism have not caused any sizeable improvement in the living standard of the masses. The defenders of the totalitarian régimes will say that the dictatorial countries were the "have-nots," and, lacking the necessary raw materials, could not develop a system which was to be an improvement on capitalism. But now that the victory over important parts of Europe, and consequently over Africa, will bring them the use of important resources, things will change, they say. I doubt that.

We certainly should see a change in the whole European system of economics, if Germany succeeded in completing her victory in Europe. But even this system, as one can see already, will essentially be based on slave labour and thus will bring no real improvement in the lives of the masses. Yet whatever proves to be the result of the German revolution, it is certain that the capitalist system was and is ailing and that it needs a complete reform if it wishes to survive. What were the chief troubles? Different people see it in different lights.

The Socialists of post-World War times used to say with Marx, that private ownership of the means of production and transport and private profit were the evils of our civilization. The capitalists used to retort by blaming labour unions and their restrictions for all the evil in this world. Capital and labour were far apart from each other in Europe.

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

When the first German revolution swept over the German lands, the proletarians used to sing:

Wer wird jetzt die Strassen kehren?  
Ja, das sind die Herrn, mit dem goldenen Sternen,  
Sie werden die Strassen kehren.

(Who is going to sweep the streets now?  
Yes, those gentlemen, with the golden distinctions,  
They will sweep the streets.)

And the middle classes, infuriated by the Socialist progress in Central Europe, used to sing (translation from the German):

We are Social Democrats, friends of everything,  
We are eating ham and chicken,  
But we do not work.

This was the mentality of those early revolutionary days. And the capitalist was described as a hard-hearted, cruel person, such as this joke shows him:

A worker, who was jobless for a long time, comes to the banker for alms. He is asking for some small help, and the banker says to his valet, "Throw him out, because my heart will break if I see his misery."

The attempts to socialize the German and Austrian Governments after the war, and the many social reforms they introduced, only increased the chasm between capital and labour; the possessing classes, not recognizing the mild bourgeois nature of the Socialist leaders, and fearing only that their own money might be in danger, became even more uncompromising towards labour than ever before.

Everybody saw the abyss between capital and labour, but too many doctors were presenting wrong diagnoses,

and even many more doctors offered too vigorous cures. Then slowly people began to agree that it was not production that was wrong, but distribution. The more enlightened critics began to assert that the old fear that there are not enough goods to go round was no longer true. Since the burning of Brazilian coffee and the curtailment of wheat, cotton, and other crops in America and Europe, it has been realized that there are plenty of goods and commodities, but that there is something wrong with distribution. The capitalist classes still maintained that the labour union restrictions were the chief cause of this plight, but this could not really be substantiated by facts.

Only a few people today realize that the fundamental fault of our society is this tremendous discrepancy between technical development, which enables us to produce goods on the largest scale, and the conservative or even reactionary nature of financial policy. Technical development during the last century, or even during recent decades, has been simply phenomenal. Forty years ago, when I was a child, there were only a few automobiles running, there were no aeroplanes, and the Zeppelin was in an experimental stage. There were only candles and oil lamps available for lighting in the houses, and only slowly did the incandescent lamp and the electric bulb win their way in lighting. Telephones were few and miserable, telegraphing was complicated. And the radio was a development of the post-World War period!

Moreover, the industries, as I said, benefited by the enormous progress of science. Every month brought a new invention or at least a new improvement in technique. The industrial magnates, or the technical personnel of the great industries, had readily accepted these inventions. Through

them mass production on a hitherto unknown scale was possible, like Bata's new shoe works in Czechoslovakia. With American help Opel in Germany was able to produce small cars cheaply and efficiently; electricity became a common household commodity, speed on railroads, on highways, and in the air was increased to figures which the boldest prophets and dreamers could not have imagined even a dozen years previously.

In this short time of forty years the greatest inventions were made, and they were amply used for the benefit of humanity by the industrialists. But what happened? The industrial revolution which produced the steam engine, the locomotive, the spinning self-actor, and all the automatic machines got thoroughly tied up with finance. And along with the development of industries, especially since their trust-like progress, financial capital got closely tied up with them. The banks have become increasingly the owners, directly or indirectly, of the industries. This was even more true in Europe than in the U.S.A. With the exception of a few great firms, like Krupp, Haniel, or Thyssen in Germany, and Pirelli in Italy, industries have become "limited companies" or incorporated companies without any personal ownership, or any personal interest of an industrialist in his concern. This interconnection of banks and industries proved to be the most fatal phenomenon of post-war times. The banks only wanted profit and they saw even more of an enemy in organized labour than did Mr. Ford himself. Mr. Ford at least is willing to concede a share, and a fairly high share, of his profits to the workers. But the banks grudged this profit.

While technical progress was proceeding by such leaps and bounds, financial progress was nil. The bankers of

## CAUSES AND AIMS OF REVOLUTIONS

1925 were thinking in exactly the same terms as their forefathers did in 1825. The sums handled by these banks became fabulous, but their methods remained obsolete, unfit to finance the gigantic problem of distribution of the commodities produced by modern technical developments.

The banker remained a profit-seeker, without any vision. And thus the banking end of the industries, that is the financial control of the industries, decided in the post-World War days that moneys available from big New York banks for Europe should be used in the service of rationalization. Rationalization is probably a good thing if it is carried through on basis of a definite plan. But the banks here wanted it because, first, it would enable them to use huge credits coming from America, and, second, because it would save so much in labour costs. But who amongst these bankers calculated in human values? The result of German rationalization was that six million workers became jobless.

These six million jobless workers were the people who voted Hitler into power. The narrow-mindedness of the bankers, the completely visionless outlook of the financiers, have brought the worst revolution in Germany into power! And many of those who promoted this move were Jews.

Thus defeat and dissatisfaction, cohesion and lack of vision of the politicians in internal affairs and the reactionary short-sightedness of finance capital, in face of a tremendous industrial development, had helped the advent of the revolutions. But what are these revolutions aiming at?

Russia, ruled by the Communists, aims at the advancement of the conditions of the workers, established a dictatorship of the proletariat for the rapid creation of a classless

and Communistic society, and claims to advocate the withering away of the State.

Fascism, originally just a revolution to abolish certain conditions which the Fascist party called intolerable, was a negative movement, which after coming to power tried to fill its existence with a philosophy and a doctrine. It denies the all-prevalent Marxian economic interpretation of history and introduces, instead of the primacy of economic reasons, the primacy of personal power. It aims at a strong, all-powerful State, with a hierarchy of a selected new aristocracy, all working for the aggrandisement and fame of the country. Economically it established planning, substituted free labour exchange through compulsory "syndicates," and settled the labour and employment questions, as well as planning problems through a corporative system. Politically it tolerates only a single party and suppresses all the others.

Naziism rests on political and economic principles similar to those of Fascism, with the exception that Germany discarded the corporate State idea, and replaced it with the Ministry of Economics and the Labour Front which regulate all the problems of the economic life of the country and settle labour disputes. The antisemitic aims of Naziism of course were always emphasized right from the beginning.

All three major régimes elevate the State as supreme and establish State control over all forms of social development. They all have discarded parliamentary rule, and yet retain a sham representative system, whether an appointed Reichstag in Germany, the Grand Fascist Council in Italy, or the Great Council of the Soviets in Russia. All three countries advocate a single party, the National

## CAUSES AND AIMS OF REVOLUTIONS

Socialist Party in Germany, the Fascist Party in Italy, and the Communist Party in Russia, and suppress the opposition parties with great ruthlessness. Yet all three States are Socialist, if Collectivism and State Socialism is accepted as a Socialist form of rule, and all three are extremely nationalistic. The present phase of the revolution, therefore (and this holds good even for the Japanese development also), can be best described as National Socialism.

## Chapter 13

### THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

IF the existing régimes in Russia, Germany, and Italy have taken the form of National Socialism, let us see how the Socialist side of this new régime shows itself in practice.

Words are often dangerous and lead to misunderstandings. I can remember that after World War I "autonomy" was the magic word whispered everywhere in Europe. Since President Wilson's thesis of self-determination every small nationality placed its hopes in this magic word. Once in the Carpatho-Ruthenian parts of Czechoslovakia I asked a peasant whether they wanted autonomy. He answered: "Autonomy is not so important to us, if we only can get the right to go again to Hungary to work during harvest time."

So it is with Socialism; everyone misunderstands the word. Whisper Socialism to a factory owner or to a financier, and he gets flushed and angry and sees decidedly "red." Mention it to naïve workers and they believe that heaven is opening before them, with angels playing soft tunes on ethereal instruments. . . . Yet now that three major States have at last put Socialism into practice, not only the owners of the means of production but also the proletarians working the machines are alike discontented.

Because of the anti-equalitarian nature of Bolshevism, Hitlerism, and Fascism, people do not realize that these



régimes are actually Socialistic. But as we have seen, even though the Socialists of the Second International were democratic and equalitarian, Marx himself was, to begin with, not quite so democratic; and moreover, even before the World War, the syndicalists had discarded democratic and equalitarian platforms. Lenin and Trotsky simply took over from the syndicalists this renunciation of equalitarianism.

Lenin once said to some visiting Spanish Socialists: "We never speak about liberty. We practise the dictatorship of the proletariat in the name of a minority, because the peasant class has not yet become proletarian and is not with us."

Stalin put it even more clearly: "Equalitarianism has nothing in common with Marxist Socialism. Only people who have no knowledge of Marxism can think in such a primitive way, as if the Russian Bolsheviks wanted to gather up all wealth together and then divide it equally."

If Bolshevism departed from equalitarian forms of Socialism, Fascism and Hitlerism were never equalitarian, though they were both *equalizing* movements. But Fascism was always for building up a hierarchy, and the creation of the Nazi *élite* is comparable with the new society created in Moscow by the leaders of the Communist Party.

Furthermore, the old Socialists, whether in Germany, Italy, or Scandinavia, believed that Socialism meant the free and liberal possibility of labour organization. How can these three régimes be called Socialist when they have abolished the principle of the freedom of labour?

But Trotsky, himself an old Socialist, taught them better when he declared: "The very principle of compulsory labour service is for the Communist quite unquestionable.

'He who works not, neither shall he eat.' . . . It is necessary once for all to make clear to ourselves that the principle itself of compulsory labour service has radically and permanently replaced the principle of free hiring, as the socialization of the means of production has replaced capitalistic property. . . . Compulsory labour service, again, is unrealizable without the abolition of the fiction of the freedom of labour, and without the substitution for it of the compulsory principle."

From still another point of view, it is hard to see these régimes as Socialist. The original Marxian Socialism intended to abolish the State; it dreamt that if the proletariat controls the means of production, the classless Communist society will be able to exist without authority from above and the State will slowly wither away.

Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin called themselves the banner-bearers of Marx's ideas, and Bolshevism the putting into practice of Marx's principles. Did the State wither away in Russia? No! Marxian Socialism in Lenin's and Stalin's interpretation has developed into the greatest experiment in State Socialism in which not the community but the State, this Leviathan, is the possessor of all means of production and livelihood. In this respect, the three régimes have been influenced by the Fabian Socialists in England, who clamoured for the nationalization (or socialization) of the means of transport and certain branches of production; from their movement was born the idea of Collectivism or State- and communal Socialism, which gained strength in Europe under the influence of the otherwise Marxist Social-Democratic parties.

Today the régimes in Russia, Germany, and Italy can be described as State Socialist experiments. The degree of

## THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

dispossession of the propertied classes may vary, yet in all three countries the State is the ultimate and supreme organizer of the economic life. The means of production in Germany and Italy may still nominally belong to individual owners, but they no longer have the right to decide either about their possessions or about the extent and nature of their production, or of the distribution of their produced goods. Some may call it State capitalism, but if capitalism is owned and controlled by one supreme body, the State, then it becomes Socialism!

Let us examine these régimes one by one. It might be thought superfluous to explain the Socialist side of the Bolshevik régime, and yet it will be useful to point out what has been achieved in the U.S.S.R., and in what form.

Russia certainly made no compromise; the establishment of the Soviet régime meant the immediate confiscation of all means of production and transport in that country. When Stalin came to power, he sought to make Russia great and strong, but when he tried to organize Russian production and population on the highly centralized lines he thought necessary in a Socialist State, he failed. Impressive plans were drafted in the various people's commissariats and in the subordinate offices, arranging on paper that a given mine should produce so much coal in 1938, and a given factory should weave so many thousands yards of textiles per day. The real production figures, however, invariably lagged behind the planned ones.

Though labour was organized in a stricter and more oppressive form than in any capitalistic country, the efforts to drive it to super-production always failed. The Stakhanovite super-production methods were hailed with much propaganda many years ago, but these methods

seriously reduced the quality of the produced goods in a country where skilled labour was scarce, and they also helped to wear the machines out faster. Stalin, the Georgian, could not believe that the plans and calculations were bad; that the reason for failure might be backwardness and insufficient technical skill. He concluded that the failure was due to sabotage.

Yet even with all these failings Russian Socialist (collectivist) economics of course achieved remarkable progress. According to Soviet official figures, the gross production of Soviet industry has raised Russia from fifth place in the world in 1913 to first place in Europe and second in the world. The coal output in 1936 was reported as fourfold that of Tsarist Russia; Soviet geologists have discovered new oil areas, and a new oil-producing industry is developing between the Volga River and the Ural Mountains (this new oil basin playing an important plan in Molotoff's new third five-year plan).

The Soviets claim that as a result of up-to-date technique in the production of ferrous metals the output has more than quadrupled since 1913. The production of huge masses of steel, special steel, and alloys has enabled the building of an engineering industry and has facilitated the production of aeroplanes, automobiles, and tractors. The production of aluminium, nickel, tin, magnesium, cadmium, vanadium, etc., has been organically developed, and Russia is the second biggest producer of aluminium in Europe, third in the world.

Soviet hydro-electric power in 1937 was seven and a half times that of Tsarist Russia. New industries such as iron and asbestos, oil, bauxite, nickel, gold, platinum, etc., were created in the Urals. There the Russians have the fine

## THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

Magnitogorsk and Tagil steel works, the Berezniki chemical plants, the copper works at Krasno-Uralsk, etc. They discovered suitable coal for coking in the Kuznetz basin in Siberia, the richest coal-field in the world.

These official Soviet figures all compare present production with that of Tsarist Russia. But let us analyse recent production figures and compare them with the figures of only a few years ago! Thus, copper output in the first half of 1938 did not exceed that of the corresponding period of 1937; production in the earlier year (statistics later than 1938 are not available or are entirely unreliable) was in excess of the corresponding period in 1936 by 25 per cent, but the quality of the ore was much lower. There were no production figures for iron ore published in 1937-38. The programme for 1938 foresaw the production of 32,000,000 tons. During the first eight months of 1938 the Kirvirog district, which provides two-thirds of the total iron-ore supply in the U.S.S.R., finished with almost 2,000,000 tons less production than was foreseen in the programme. The control figure (the figure forecast in the programme) for 1937 was 16,000,000 tons, the actual output 14,500,000. The control figure for 1938 was 16,280,000 tons and the first nine months yielded 11,142,000 tons.

For steel, the control figures for 1937 and 1938 were 20,150,000 and 20,260,000 tons, respectively. The actual yield in 1937 was 17,800,000 tons, and in the first nine months of 1938 only 13,095,000 tons! There is good reason to believe that the production of both manganese and nickel was not up to expectations. The production of bauxite (aluminium ore) amounted in the first six months of 1938 to 89.2 per cent of the programme. Coal production in 1937

was slightly below 1936, and considerably below plan provisions.

The Soviet oil trust produced 3,500,000 tons less in 1937 than the control figures contemplated. Instead of 9,760,000 tons of crude oil to be obtained from new wells, only 7,000,000 tons were gained. There were more than 3,000 cases of damage (sabotage) during drilling operations in 1937. Out of the total 13,000 wells available, only 8,500 were actually producing at the beginning of 1938, which means that only 65 per cent of all the wells could be exploited.

The production of the important engineering and machine works showed as much delay as mining. Thus the Stalin automobile factory in Moscow is said to have produced 43 per cent below the original programme figure; the Molotoff works in Gorky and the Stalingrad tractor works 13 per cent below control figures. In the Putiloff works near Leningrad faulty production amounted to as much as 66 per cent for aeroplane motors.

The reasons for this sudden deterioration of Soviet production are manifold; among them, as we have seen, are the Stakhanovite methods. Another reason for the relapse is the absence of foreign experts and still another, political persecutions which seriously interfere with the efficiency of the workers. Though these persecutions were intended to increase efficiency by eliminating sabotage, in reality they worked the other way!

The socialization of agriculture failed to an even greater extent than did the socialization of industry. If we believe the Soviet rulers, then immense achievements were reached even in agriculture. They point out that during the Tsarist days 381,250,000 acres of land out of the total

## THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

917,500,000 belonged to the Tsarist family, big land-owners, and the Church, while 200,000,000 acres belonged to rich peasants, the kulaks. The collective farming system has transformed the country into a Socialist agricultural land. On January 1, 1939, 93 per cent of the peasant farms and 99 per cent of the sown area of these farms were collectively owned and worked. The Soviet leaders rightly point out how wooden ploughs and other bad agricultural implements were replaced by modern machinery and tractors.

Are the peasants, however, finally won over to the idea of collectivism? We know that some years ago their open revolt against collectivization caused the death of five to eight million of the rural population. Large numbers of kulaks were deported to the Arctic regions.

Careful study of Russian publications shows that the Russian peasant is still not satisfied. The members of the Kolchos are apparently dissatisfied with the low percentage which has been distributed from Kolchos revenues.

All this, however, should not be taken as a denial of Russian achievement nor as heralding the failure of the Russian Socialist experiment. The truth is that in face of the huge size of the country and the backward nature of the population, the Soviets have indeed achieved miracles. But great as the achievements were, equally great were the mistakes of the leaders. In a country in which under the Tsars a large amount of *laissez-faire* was permitted to local governors, Stalin tried to introduce the maximum of centralization, not only in political life and in administration, but also in economics. One people's commissariat in Moscow was to lead the whole industrial life of the country. The third five-year plan provides a large amount of decen-

tralization, and if the old centralization efforts were heralded as Socialism, the present one will probably be described as "passing over to Communism." The incapacity of the Russians to grasp technical matters also naturally handicapped the rapid development of industrialization, and with it the progress of Socialism.

How has the German National Socialist régime succeeded in establishing its Socialist side? we must ask. Various persons answer this question variously. Herr Hermann Rauschning, a former National Socialist, who, however, comes from the landowning class, believes that National Socialism is a version of Bolshevism; Herr Otto Strasser, another fugitive from the National Socialist camp, but a former Socialist, of course believes that Hitler betrayed Socialism.

I have always maintained that Naziism was a revolutionary apparition even if it paraded in a counter-revolutionary form. It is true that one year after the coming to power of the party in Germany, Hermann Goering and the anti-Socialist group seemed to have won the upper hand, and the purge of June 30, 1934, eliminated the important Socialist leader in the party, Gregor Strasser. This purge, which at least temporarily brought the anti-Socialist group to the head of the party, had only helped to assure the "appeasers" in the West that Hitler was to be the liberator from Bolshevism.

But it was a mistake to overlook the revolutionary and Socialist forces in the Nazi Party. Nominally the dangerous bodies were eliminated. But the truth is that many of the Socialists in the party not only survived but gained influence. There was Doctor Paul Josef Goebbels, who by the time of the purge was already minister of propaganda. He



saved his life by fleeing to Godesberg, where the Fuehrer was staying. Doctor Heinrich Himmler, the former aide-de-camp of the murdered Gregor Strasser, has never voiced his opinions since he was made the powerful master of the German police and the Nazi Gestapo, but by nature he was, and is, an extremist Socialist who is well acquainted with the entire revolutionary literature, as is Doctor Goebbels. It was not realized that Walther Darré's "blood-and-soil" theory about agriculture was in many ways as revolutionary as the reforms in Russia. Nor was it understood abroad that Doctor Robert Ley, the leader of the German Labour Front, was an advanced revolutionary and Socialist.

Moreover, although Hitler was originally neither a revolutionary nor a Socialist, and later broke with Gottfried Feder, from whom he derived much of the Socialist part of the party programme, dictators carefully watch the undercurrents in the party and yield to the strongest: and the Socialist wing has been increasing in Germany ever since Munich. It was mostly under Doctor Goebbels's and Doctor Ley's influence that National Socialist Germany has become increasingly a Socialist State where the capitalist had only a very sorry rôle to fulfil. Already in 1938 this joke circulated in the cafés of Vienna (and it characterizes the situation better than anything else):

"What is the difference between Russian Bolshevism and German Naziism?"

The other answers: "Very little. The Bolshevik goes to the peasant or the farmer and says: 'You have a cow. This cow now belongs to the State.' The Nazi goes to the farmer and says: "You have a cow. The cow is yours and remains yours. It is your private property. In fact, we only

ask you to feed it well with the best fodder and look after it in every way. And we want nothing from you except the milk, and if the cow passes away, the meat and the hide!’ ”

This joke rightly illustrates the difference between the two régimes, which is rather psychological than real. The Nazi State maintains the fiction of private property, but the State controls and trades everything. The factory is yours, but you can manufacture only things which you are told to make; the State determines the nature and quality as well as the quantity of what you produce; the State provides the raw materials and the State directs your sale.

This stern regimentation in German production was carried through in the name of the requirements of the army. But rearmament was necessary to carry through such conquests as will later on assure the success of the National Socialist experiment and economic system on a large scale. Even in this regard there is great similarity between Russia and Germany. Stalin’s socialization was, and is, primarily in the interests of the Red army, because the army will have to guarantee the ultimate success of the Russian experiment. Russia of course needs no conquests for raw materials because she has them already at home in large quantities; Germany, before being able to complete a final Socialist State, must make conquests for raw materials.

For this reason the last six years of National Socialism were devoted to building up a planned economy in the interest of defence, which the German leaders called *Wehrwirtschaft*—war or defence economics. Marshal Goering was responsible for the leadership of this system, but the brain behind this organized economics was Major-General Loeb.

## THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

To attain these strict national economics stringent restrictive measures were introduced for finance, trade, and industry. One of the most important factors of these regulations was the price-restriction decree of October, 1936, which entitled the price commissar to fix prices just above cost basis. The whole sale index in Germany indeed had risen in seven years from 90·7 in 1929 to 109·6 in 1936. Even the cost of living rose only by 25 per cent.

Following Italy's example, during the Abyssinian war, Germany restricted profits (by compulsory investment in Government loans or returning the money to the industry in form of new installations), to 6 or 8 per cent. Surplus profits had to be invested also in important plants such as Buna (artificial) rubber, oil made synthetically from coal, and the exploitation of the low quality *Ocker* ores of Bavaria or of the Siegen district. It restricted the erection of new plants and ordered the control of the raw material allotted to the factories, partly by making it dependent on licences of the Ministry of Economics and by controlling foreign exchange.

While private profit nominally was still possible, the finance market was restricted by all kinds of regulations, which provided for compulsory investment in national savings, in national loans, payment of insurance, etc. All big companies had not only to subscribe to the continuous new issues of Government bonds and war bonds, but also to accept Government script and short-term treasury bills. The salaries of the managers and members of boards of directors were drastically restricted.

There were various restriction also on labour, especially by fixing wages on the deflated wage level of the pre-Nazi accession year. Labour has in reality become a conscript army. The labour front commanded the worker where to

work; if a skilled worker in one branch was needed for less skilled work, and vice versa, he was simply commandeered. The abolition of the right to strike was a natural consequence of the nature of the régime, and even in this Naziism was at one with Bolshevism.

The man in the street felt the effects of these economics through the drastic restriction of food and all other necessities. In the true Socialist way all commodities were rationed. Food rationing was carefully calculated according to available stocks; for textile commodities people obtained ration cards of a value of 120 points, and, for example, a winter coat took away 80 points, a pair of stockings 10 points.

While Doctor Ley has acted as a true Socialist (in the Bolshevik sense) on the labour front, Walther Darré, the leader of German agriculture, carried through his "blood-and-soil" experiments in his field. The Bolshevik régime antagonized the peasant by taking away his land and making him a member of the socialized Kolchos; Darré not only told the peasant that the farm was his, but if the property had been for many generations in the possession of the same family, he created an *Erbgut* (hereditary, unalienable, entailed property) of it.

Ever since 1933 German agriculture has been socialized in a public compulsory cartel, which included not only the producers and landowners but even the retail distributors. Market commissions were organized after 1934 for the control of the market. Restrictive regulations grew tighter, especially for butter, eggs, bread, potatoes, cattle, and wool. The market commissions even decided that the farmers had to deliver certain quantities to the market determined by the board; the small holders were restricted

## THE SOCIALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION

to growing certain kinds of produce. The farmer was told what to grow, how much to grow, and what kind of seeds to use. He was directed what quality and quantity of fertilizer should be employed on his farm, and was under the strictest supervision on behalf of these marketing boards. The prices of agricultural produce were high, and thus the farmer, making fair profits, did not object to this Government interference, which, however, virtually amounted to socializing measures.

By these Socialist measures German unemployment, which exceeded 6,000,000 in 1933, had been reduced to 165,000 by the spring of 1940 and probably will disappear altogether by this autumn. Though wages remained the same during the seven years of the National Socialist régime, earnings, mostly due to overtime and longer hours, increased by 15 per cent since 1933.

The Nazi Socialist, Doctor Robert Ley, has obtained marked success with the workers through a kind of Socialist measure for creating post-work leisure organizations, known as *Kraft durch Freude*—Strength through Joy. Workers have paid vacations, and the Strength through Joy organization had many chartered seafaring ships which took the workers for long holiday trips.

The motto of the old Socialist wing of the Nazi Party used to be the overthrow of the ruling class (the Junkers), of hereditary wealth and of finance capital. Finance capital was successfully smashed at the beginning of the régime, and the direction of finance is now for all practical purposes in the hands of the State. The Junker class, once all-mighty in old Prussia, is no longer a privileged class, its place having been filled by the National Socialist *élite*—and probably the only part of this Socialist “threat” not yet

carried out is the overthrow of hereditary wealth. In so far as many of the wealthy people were Jews, and they were dispossessed, even this promise has been partly fulfilled. And the overthrow of hereditary industrial capital itself has been to a large extent effected. August Thyssen, Hitler's financier in early days, is now an exile and his fortune has been confiscated. Will others follow?

There is no shadow of doubt that the National Socialist régime in Germany today holds the second part of its name truthfully, while a few years ago it was probably only "window-dressing." If the Greater Germany should be formed, as the result of a complete subjugation of Europe, and if in consequence Germany should have at her disposal the African raw materials of these subjugated Powers, she could then build up an even more explicitly Socialist régime.

The course of events in Italy is not very different from that in Germany. Mussolini, the former syndicalist, however, arranged this economic system in a way which at least can be considered as a heritage of the syndicalist system. The corporative system introduced into Fascism is a watered form of syndicalism. Originally the syndicalists dreamt of the twenty-two corporations or syndicates which should rule the economic life of Italy. Mussolini, tempered by the attainment of power, modified this rule by the syndicates or labour unions to a joint rule by capital and labour. But capital under him is divested of its old privileges.

Already in 1935 Mussolini was boasting that capitalism would be suppressed in Fascist Italy. The labour charter, the corporative charter, and much of the financial and economic legislation indeed have taken away privileges

from the owners of capital or factories. But despite all boasts Italy remained a capitalist country up to the Abyssinian war. The African campaign enabled him to introduce far-reaching restrictions on finance, and took away the profits and excess profits of the war industries and the suppliers of the Government, while the shortage of raw materials enabled Italy to make a controlled economic system which resembles very much that of Germany, and which must be described as a Socialist one.

The revolutionary and Socialist nature of the German and Italian régimes has come even more to the surface during the war of 1939-40. Already in the spring of 1940 the Italian Press had begun to write about "proletarian" States instead of "have-not" States. It was a decided gesture to "proletarian-ruled" Russia. Germany soon adopted this shibboleth, and now the German, Russian, and Italian States refer to themselves as the "proletarian States."

And the man in the street in Berlin says with acrid humour:

"Hitler is now a triple Aryan: a veget-arian, a totalit-arian, and a prolet-arian."

## Chapter 14

### THE NATIONALIST SIDE OF THE REVOLUTION IN ITALY AND RUSSIA

THE revolution, or rather its children, the Russian, German, and Italian régimes, are strange amphibian apparitions; on one side, they are carried on the fast wings of their revolutionary *élan*; on the other side, they are burdened by the weight of a heavy anchor, called tradition, which manifests itself just in the national aspect of these régimes. The nationalism in all three revolutions is traditional, even if it takes violent forms.

We have seen the common revolutionary and Socialist characteristics of the three régimes. But there remains the nationalist side. Nobody needs to explain the nationalist character of German and Italian régimes. But the world used to think of Communism as an international movement. And so it was. Its universal rather than national character was what made it feared everywhere.

During the post-war years, let us say from 1917 until 1927, patriotism was considered the greatest crime in Russia. But people have failed to see that this has changed, since on Lenin's death the former secretary of the Communist Party, Josef Stalin, established his régime over that of the Russian revolution.

The first indication of the change was given when shortly after Lenin's death Stalin gave out the slogan, "Socialism in a single country!" Trotsky and the old



Bolsheviks were infuriated. This was betrayal of the revolution and of Father Marx!

Let us quote here a keen and shrewd observer who lived in Russia just in the period when this change from internationalism to nationalism was effected. Eugene Lyons, in his book, *Stalin*, writes:

“Communism in the years after Lenin was gradually purged of its non-Russian ingredients. It emerged as ‘national Communism’—the exact parallel in many ways of the ‘national Socialism’ that was already gaining headway in Germany under the messianic drive of Adolf Hitler.”

Naturally the Soviet leaders for a long time clung to international phrases, but the régime became increasingly nationalistic. In my book *South of Hitler* I wrote, as early as 1937:

“Ten years ago Stalin already realized that World Revolution could be created only after a general conflagration, and that pending such a conflagration he should be content to establish a Communist or Socialist economic system in one country alone. By 1936 Stalin had found the Communists who still dreamt of World Revolution and of Bolshevization of other countries a liability which was not worth being carried unless one was determined to risk a war. The various trials of Communist ex-leaders undoubtedly purposed the liquidation of the revolutionary movement beyond the boundaries of Soviet Russia. But if the world-wide revolutionary movement is to be abandoned, what is the Russian system? In Central Europe many people believe that the natural development must be a kind of National Socialism—Russian Nationalist, but truly socialistic, probably a National Socialism such as Gregor Strasser once contemplated developing in Germany.

This I wrote in 1937. Mr. Lyons's words, written in 1940, bear out my predictions.

Has Stalin abandoned the idea of world revolution? No. His formula is simpler. He is helping the birth in other countries of régimes similar to his. Without interference from Russia, German Naziism and Italian Fascism grew very like Russian Stalinism. Stalin probably hopes that with the passing years there will be more and more such "National Socialist régimes." And then internationalism will be born as an integration of these individual National Socialisms! But Stalin knows that this is music of the future!

Suddenly the word "fatherland" crept back into the dictionary of the Russians. On February 4, 1931, in a speech before the first All-Union Conference of the Workers of Socialist Industries in Moscow, Stalin pointed out that the Russians have always been exploited and defeated by Mongolian khans, Turkish beys, Swedish feudal lords, Polish-Lithuanian adventurers, Anglo-French capitalists, and Japanese barons. Now Russians had to work for the fatherland (*sic*) and make it so strong that nobody should be able to defeat and exploit it. Stalin had to admit, however, that Russia was fifty or a hundred years behind the Western nations in these matters.

Again Eugene Lyons writes:

"... There was a far-reaching revival of nationalism (in Russia) in the crudest, most chauvinistic meaning of the term. The concepts of fatherland, holy native soil, sacred national history, were not merely revived. In some respects they were newly created, since patriotism in the Western sense had never been deeply rooted in Russia."

Then Stalin went one step further. He brought back the

old idols and heroes. In 1920 anybody could have been killed for comparing a Bolshevik leader with Tsar Peter the Great. The great merit of the revolution, so it was asserted, was that it had thrown off the yoke of the Tsars. None of them were ever good! But now, according to Mr. Lyons,

"The standard national heroes were dusted off and put again on the pedestals. Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, even the legendary Prince Vladimir, who brought Christianity to the Russians, were installed in the Soviet pantheon. Each of them in his way was reinterpreted as a precursor of one greater destined to come in the shape of Stalin."

Stalin's favourite hero undoubtedly was Peter the Great, Tsar of all the Russias. And the cult of Peter the Great was first semi-officially and later officially encouraged. In the early 1930's Count Alexis Tolstoy, a relative of the great writer Count Leo Tolstoy, wrote a book about Peter the Great in which a parallel was obviously drawn between the Peter of the seventeenth century and the new Peter the Great of our age. Even more distinctly was this propaganda made in a film about Peter the Great. Even Peter's cruelty was praised as a justification of Stalin's rigid firmness. The building of St. Petersburg (now Leningrad) on the marshes of the Neva River with the aid of compulsory forced labour was presented as the foreshadowing of even greater constructions to follow. When Peter in this film surveys the city which bore his name (until the Bolshevik revolution changed it to Leningrad), the city built on the sweat and toil, blood and bones, of tens of thousands of unfortunate muziks, the Tsar exclaims:

"I have passed through tears and blood—  
have done for Holy Mother Russia!"

The former enemy of the Tsars now revq

traditions. And his newly established nationalism and Russian patriotism was aiming at the restoration of the Russia once ruled by the Tsars! Thus here again the aims of Stalin and Hitler run together, for Stalin's first nationalistic aim involved the destruction of the territorial provisions of the Versailles Treaty. Though Russia did not sign this peace treaty, the Versailles Powers deprived Russia of the possession of many of her former provinces by inciting them to declare their independence. Autonomous Finland broke away and became an independent republic; Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania declared their independence, while Rumania clandestinely seized Bessarabia in March, 1918, when the Russian revolution was engaged in a bitter struggle with Denikin's White counter-revolutionaries in the Ukraine.

Who brought Finland, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to the Russian Crown? Tsar Peter the Great, Stalin's hero. Stalin probably dreamt of the moment when he could make the pathetic gesture of declaring, "Father Tsar Peter, I am bringing back to Holy Mother Russia what vandal hands have detached from your heritage!" Furthermore, his long-cherished plan aimed at the conquest that Peter had failed to achieve: Sweden. Moreover, Peter the Great was not the only Russian ruler whose conquests Stalin felt it his duty to restore. There was Catherine the Great, wife of Peter's grandson, who with Frederick the Great of Prussia had defeated Poland and divided it between Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Versailles Treaty had revived Poland; Stalin must bring back to Russia the heritage of Catherine. Furthermore, Tsar Alexander I had annexed Bessarabia in 1812 during the war with Turkey; Stalin must reconquer the heritage of Alexander I, which had

been lost to Rumania. The traditional line of Russian policy under Stalin is best characterized by the fact that all endeavours to induce him to accept the *fait accompli* in Bessarabia remained futile. Even the treaty of non-aggression signed in 1933 between Russia and Rumania explicitly stated that it did not mean Russia's renunciation of the Bessarabian province, which she continued to regard as part of her own territory.

Stalin awaited only the opportunity to regain all these conquests of the Tsars. After Munich, it was clear to him that Hitler was expecting war with the Western democracies. He himself had already made his choice, but before definitely committing himself to Germany, he wanted to obtain the maximum price.

France was, of course, Russia's ally, Which side was Russia going to take in a possible war between the West and Germany? This question was eagerly asked by the French emissaries. Stalin, with his Oriental cunning, naturally assured France that Russia wanted to fulfil her treaty obligations, but he set a price. This price was the return of the heritage of the Tsars: the Baltic countries, plus Finland, part of Poland, and all of Bessarabia.

France and England were ready to fulfil all the other Russian conditions, but they could not promise to give away lands which had obtained their independence through the Allied Powers' own intervention in 1918-19 and in the years that followed. So Stalin turned to Germany.

Even she was hesitant to begin with. The first offer of von Ribbentrop to Stalin for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact, as we have seen, proposed a fourth division of Poland and a division of the Baltic countries into spheres of interest, allotting Finland and Estonia to Russia

and Latvia and Lithuania to Germany. But the successor of Peter the Great demanded the whole of the Baltic. And Bessarabia. The German game was already set in Poland, and Germany's Fuehrer waited impatiently for Stalin to range himself on his side, or at least to declare himself neutral, thus averting the possibility of a two-front war—that nightmare of the German general staff. To attain this one-front war—Poland was counted as only a minor opponent—Germany had to make sacrifices. And thus the Baltic provinces were promised to Stalin.

As early as September Russian troops occupied the parts of Poland which had been promised them. Poor Tuchatchevsky! Poor Uborevitch! who for their treason in conspiring with Germany to regain the lost Polish provinces were put before the firing-squad!

In the autumn of 1939 Stalin demanded that certain strategically important islands in the Baltic and all the important Baltic ports, including Paltiski in Estonia, Liepaja in Latvia, etc., should be occupied by Russian troops. The weak Baltic republics could do nothing else but consent. Before December 1, 1939, half of the heritage of Peter the Great was thus reincorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Hardly had the crisis in the Baltic republics passed when the Russo-Finnish conflict created excitement all over the world. This war did show up some of the weaknesses of the Red army; nevertheless, it was clear that Russia was able to conquer the whole of Finland if she wanted to do so. But for various reasons Stalin accepted a compromise. As price of the peace with Finland he attained almost half of Finland's territory and an important naval base at Hangoe. Those who believe, however, that Stalin is now

satisfied with his "half-success" in Finland are sadly mistaken. He appointed in August, 1940, Otto Kusineen, the ill-famed president of the Finnish Soviet Republic, established at the beginning of the Finnish war, to a high post in the Bolshevik hierarchy, which can be taken as a sign that the days of Kusineen are still to come. . . . The calvary of Finland is not over. . . . Finland belongs to the heritage of Peter the Great, and therefore it cannot be finally renounced.

In May, 1940, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia were incorporated in Russia as Soviet republics. It was in July, 1940, that an ultimatum demanded from Rumania the return of the Bessarabian province. Rumania had to yield. Russian troops occupied Bessarabia, thus restoring this heritage of Alexander I to Stalin's Empire. The Tsar is dead. Long live the Red Tsar.

The nationalist part of the Italian régime will appear more obvious to my readers than was that of Russia. Signor Mussolini, ever since 1914, has shown and proved himself to be an ardent nationalist, and as a nationalist he was an Italian imperialist, too.

I wrote in *South of Hitler* in 1937:

"There is not the least doubt that Signor Mussolini sincerely . . . believes that he is the chosen of the gods to restore to Rome the military and imperial glory of its ancient emperors. He reached this belief by a long route. As a Socialist journalist he learned from Henri Bergson the philosophy of the *élan vital*; from Georges Sorel the philosophy of violence; from Friedrich Nietzsche he learned to despise the masses; and from Machiavelli he absorbed the philosophy of cynicism in political rule. At

the height of his power, Mussolini became interested in Napoleon. . . . His later studies concerned the lives of the Roman emperors.

"Rome's historic past has filled his mind for many years. Twelve years ago he ordered . . . the liberation of the forums of the Caesars. Between the Forum of Trajan and Augustus he constructed a wide road now called the *Via dell' Impero*. On a wall of the lower end of this road have been fixed four huge bas-relief maps showing the development of the Roman Empire during a thousand years. The first map shows Europe in the year 800 B.C.; on it Rome is only a small white speck. The second map illustrates the position in the year 146 B.C., at the end of the Punic Wars, when the whole peninsula was in Rome's possession and parts of Iberia and Greece as well as Carthage (the Tunis of today) belonged to her. The third map shows the extent of the Roman Empire at the death of Augustus in A.D. 14; the fourth depicts the empire under Trajan in A.D. 117, when Britain, France, the whole of southern Europe, and northern Africa, including Libya and Egypt, as well as Asia Minor, Syria, and what is today the Kingdom of Iraq, belonged to the Roman dominion."

And I quoted from Mussolini's book, which was a kind of compendium of Fascist philosophy, the following passage:

"The Fascist State is the will to power and domination. The Roman tradition becomes herewith an idea of might. In the Fascist doctrines the imperium is not only a territorial, military, and mercantile expression, but is a spiritual and moral idea. One can imagine an imperium, that is, a nation which governs other nations, without necessitating the conquest of a single square mile of land. The endeavour



for the imperium—that is for the extension of the nation—is for Fascism an expression of life; its opposite, the static spirit, is a sign of decay. Nations which are being created or which are reborn are imperialistic; only dying countries renounce. Fascism, therefore, is the most suitable doctrine to represent the inclinations and spirit of a people who, like the Italian nation, have been reborn after many centuries of neglect and foreign rule.”

Without knowing this passage of Mussolini’s book, it is difficult to understand what has happened in Italy since 1935.

I quoted in this book of mine in 1937 conversations with Fascists in Rome before the outbreak of the Abyssinian war. Even then many Fascists declared that Egypt “ought” to belong to Italy. “It is an impossible situation,” they stated, “that another Power should be in the position to close the Suez Canal, the only artery of traffic to our colonies.”

Others indignantly said: “It is outrageous that another nation should be able to bottle us up in the Mediterranean—at Gibraltar and Suez! We must end this anomaly.”

The victory in Abyssinia naturally had made Italy even more Mediterranean-minded. “The old cry *Mare Nostrum* is again heard, but this time not referring to the Adriatic, but to the blue waves and the rocky shores of the Mediterranean. Gibraltar and the Spanish hinterland, Oriental Africa, Egypt and the Sudan, have become the true interest of the Fascist.” All this I wrote in 1937.

Mussolini never made a secret of the fact that his Italy would be a national, imperialistic, and expansive State. The beginning of his rule was characterized by a high-handed act: an attack on the Greek territory of Corfu.

Since the Abyssinian campaign, I must say, the whole world has realized the truly expansive nature of Fascism. If the tablets on the *Via dell' Impero* in Rome were not sufficient indication of his aims, then various speeches in the Fascist Parliament (or rather, in the Fascist Grand Council), as well as the slogans voiced by the masses listening to Mussolini's speeches, gave a clear indication as to these aims. Already in 1929 there were demonstrations for Dalmatia. The crowd, incited by fiery articles of the controlled Italian Press against Jugoslavia, shouted, "Dalmatia, Ragusa, Trau, Spalato!" This anti-Jugoslav agitation died down, but its cessation was only a well-controlled temporary affair, and the Jugoslavs knew only too well that these slogans might again be revived.

Then came a period of comparative quiet in which Fascism tried to look like the peacemaker of Europe. It was on November 30, 1938, that old, forgotten shibboleths were suddenly renewed. In the Fascist Grand Council "spontaneous" shouts were heard: "Tunis, Corsica, Nice!" On December 1 the Italian Press took up the campaign, which was renewed in the following February. Europe was in those days in a state of the utmost tension. A few months had already passed since Munich, and it was obvious that Italy and her dictator could not watch with folded hands the unqualified successes of Hitler. The Spanish Civil War was on, with German and Italian help. When it began, the possessors of power in England had looked upon the Franco group as the representatives of the "decent" people; the Loyalists were in their eyes a lot of rowdies and hooligans, real "Reds." Only the opposition of the English labour or Socialist parties prevented the propertied classes from giving Franco open support.

But by the late winter of 1938 Franco was already within visible reach of the Mediterranean parts of the country, and this made the British uneasy. Now they began to realize that the Spanish Civil War amounted to another Germano-Italian victory! And just at that moment the cries for Tunis, Corsica, and Nice were raised!

France, undermined by the Lavals and Flandins, did not awaken even then. England, which under Neville Chamberlain's rule remained rather insensitive to Germany's expansion attempts in the East—"We must give Germany a chance somewhere," said the appeasers—became extremely nervous when the deputies of the Fascist corporative chamber were raising these shouts. Well, neither Tunis nor Corsica nor Nice was a British possession. But they were all places in the Mediterranean. And while the eastern expansion of Germany did not worry the British, anything of that sort in the Mediterranean caused them to be anxious. Especially the Labour Party and the Liberals raised their voices against these Italian claims.

The shouts in the Fascist Grand Council coincided with a serious internal political crisis in France. Coincided, I said. In reality, that moment was chosen precisely because there was an internal crisis in France. Many of the crises created by Germany during the years 1936 to 1939 were timed to coincide with one in France. The new year of 1938 brought a new crisis in France, and lo! there came Berchtesgaden and the conquest of Austria. Now, in the early months of 1939 Daladier had his conflict with the workers, who refused to work longer hours on munition, and armament orders. It looked as if a major crisis would follow in French internal politics; Italy believed the French crisis would give her the opportunity to solve her Mediter-

anean problems without a war. When these hopes were disappointed, she had to postpone her Mediterranean aims, but Hitler used the last waves of the crisis in France for a quick occupation of Bohemia and Moravia, whose integrity and independence he had solemnly pledged only a few months before at Munich.

Italy could no longer follow the policy of "Wait and see." She had to do something. Mediterranean action meant war—war against the joint Franco-British fleet. What could be done? Mussolini thereupon occupied Albania on Good Friday, 1939—he knew that neither France nor Britain would start a war because of Albania.

The alleged cause of the occupation was some minor action by King Zog of Albania. But six weeks before the actual occupation all plans were drawn and everything was set for it. In early March I reported both in the *Chicago Daily News* and in *Ken* magazine that Italy contemplated the occupation of the Albanian lands.

It was, however, clear that the conquest of Albania did not make Italy a "satisfied" nation. Her appetite was greater than that. In 1939 Count Ciano and von Ribbentrop met repeatedly in Milan, Salzburg, and Berlin as well as in Berchtesgaden.

The German and Italian Foreign Ministers had a meeting shortly before the war broke out in the autumn of 1939. When Italy declared her neutrality, or rather non-belligerency, the Allied statesmen sighed with relief. But not the French army. Italian intervention in the autumn of 1939 would probably have enabled France to achieve a victory against the country of Mussolini and thus bare the wing—the flank—of Hitler. But shrewd Mussolini did not oblige the Allies with such an intervention. Count Ciano

declared in December, 1939, before the Fascist Grand Council that Italy was adopting an attitude of non-belligerency, even though he showed that his country's—or rather his Government's—sympathies were for Germany. The resolution of the Grand Council on December 8, 1939, declared that events “fully justified Italy's decision taken in the Grand Council on September 1 establishing the non-belligerency of Italy, a decision which has up to the present averted the extension of the conflict to south-eastern and Mediterranean Europe, and which the Grand Council again confirms.”

In the first months of 1940 this attitude was fully maintained. It seemed that Italy would keep out of the war. Her old habit was to join the victorious group of Powers, and yet the victory of Germany was looking less and less probable as the months passed by in utter idleness on the Western front. But Mussolini was growing more restless about the increasing pacifism in Italy and the contentment of Italian public opinion with the policy of *non-belligerenza*. The hatred of Germans was rapidly growing.

Mussolini, who for a long time had disliked Hitler, now was of a different opinion. His whole prestige and hopes would be shattered if Germany did not win. First, he knew that the fate of Fascism was coupled with the fate of Germany; and second, he was convinced that German organization and military talent would win a victory over Allied sluggishness and clumsiness. With the exception of the firebrands in his own party, he disagreed with everybody.

“I am like an animal. I sense the things that are coming; and my instincts never fail me,” he said to his son-in-law. And he predicted that Germany would win the fight

against France. He was sure that the *Blitzkrieg* would come and would succeed.

In March, 1940, Mussolini suddenly departed for the Brenner, where he met Hitler in a conference in his private saloon car. This conference was decisive. Hitler told Mussolini that the *Blitzkrieg* was to start at the end of April or in May. The two statesmen agreed that as soon as the French armies were in retreat, Italy would start the attack from the other side, thus exerting a double pressure. Accordingly, while the totalitarian war was raging in Flanders and northern France, Italy abandoned her non-belligerency, and declared war on France and Great Britain.

Italian nationalism after Mussolini's own heart was on the march. Corsica, Nice, and Tunis, *irridenta* ("unredeemed") Italian lands, the unfulfilled heritage of Cavour and Garibaldi, were now to be incorporated into the *Unita Italia*—United Italy—while future gains in Africa and in the Balkans would form part of the second Roman Empire.

## Chapter 15

### THE NATIONALIST SIDE OF THE GERMAN REVOLUTION

THE tremendous debasement of an ill-conceived peace treaty and the unhappy youth of an Austrian are responsible for the German nationalist revival.

I visited the places which were connected with Hitler's Spartan youth immediately after he had assumed power in Germany; that is, before the legends had had time to grow. The family "library" in Leonding (where he spent his life until the age of eighteen) consisted of one book, a picture book of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1871, with Prince Otto Bismarck on the frontispiece.

The education of his father was very limited; old Hitler started life as a cobbler, and all that he learned, he acquired as a grown-up man when, with the help of his first wife's money, he got a quick schooling, called *Prax*, and with it passed the examination which qualified him for Government service as a customs official. His political knowledge was both limited and confused. Like many other Upper-Austrians, he was impressed by Schoenerer's pan-German and anti-clerical ideas, but how confused his political thinking was is shown by what Hitler's guardian, Herr Franz Mayerhofer, told me. Old Hitler, with two other pensioned State officials, always celebrated the birthday of Emperor Francis Joseph by getting drunk and then, on the way home, the three cried aloud, "*Hoch der Kaiser!*"

("Long live the Emperor!"). Yet Schoenerer's pan-Germanism was primarily directed against the Habsburg Monarchy, the German parts of which he intended to detach and attach to Prussia.

This pan-Germanist picture book, the somewhat confused greater-German and anti-clerical ideas of the father, and the decidedly pro-German teachings of a rabid *Gross-Deutsch* school-teacher in Linz shaped young Hitler into an admirer of Frederick the Great and Bismarck; the young Austrian subject of Emperor Francis Joseph became a prophet of the union of the two German-speaking countries. Even in the days of Schoenerer the motto was, "*Ein Volk, ein Reich!*" ("One nation, one Reich!")

The narrow-minded paragraphs of the Treaty of Versailles pushed Germany into a stupor and melancholy. The German folk went through a state of mind which in a private person would have been called apathy or even psychosis.

One of the great qualities of the Anglo-Saxon peoples is that they can accept a defeat. The Germans cannot. And thus there was only one way to awake them from their lethargy, caused by the shock of the defeat: to promise them economic and national revival. The recipe was simple, but to employ the cure, a first-class charlatan was needed. The German nation found this quack in Adolf Hitler. He said: "You great German nation, why are you downhearted? You have not been defeated, you have only been betrayed. If you follow me I will lead you to a rebirth of your national life, and instead of accepting the present conditions, we will lead German nationalism from one victory to another."

In the 1920's, and then in the thirties, the Nazi move-



ment was more nationalistic than socialistic. The explanation for this phenomenon lies not only in the fact that Hitler was always more nationalistic than socialistic, but also, as Otto Strasser explains, under the influence of the ambitious economic ideas of the iron magnate August Thyssen, who was then financing the party. Thyssen wanted to make Germany great and powerful; to achieve this he realized that suitable economic conditions had to be created. Germany needed to regain, and to gain further, raw-material depots, and find markets for the enormous production which she was going to reach if she conquered the lands which could offer her these prime materials.

This Thyssenite idea was, in reality, a return to the old Berlin-Baghdad policy. Thyssen also had a special interest in the reconquest of Lorraine. There is iron ore in Lorraine, coal and coke in Westphalia. To obtain one ton of iron, three tons of Lorraine *minette* iron ore and one ton of coke were required. If the steelworks were in Westphalia and Rhineland, therefore, three carloads of ore would have to be brought in to produce one carload of steel or iron. Economic principles thus dictated that the steelworks should be erected in Lorraine.

Yet the German general staff, for military reasons, discouraged the building of iron- and steelworks so near the French frontier. Krupp and the steel trust followed this warning, but Thyssen built his largest new plant, one of the most modern steelworks in the world, at Hagendingen in Lorraine. When after the war Lorraine was incorporated into France, all these German works in Lorraine were confiscated and made integral parts of various properties of the Comité des Forges (the association of the French

ironmasters), such as the Hadir, the Nord et l'Est, and the huge Luxembourg trust *Arbed*.

Moreover, Thyssen's works in the Ruhr and the Rhineland were absolutely handicapped through shortage of ore. German Lorraine contained eight hundred million tons of ore and supplied eighty per cent of German home ore production before 1918. Owing to the loss of German Lorraine, Thyssen was obliged to buy from the French ironmasters the very iron ore which had once been his.

Thyssen swore revenge. He decided to finance the movement which had on its banner two of his basic ideals: "Crush Bolshevik Russia and extirpate Communism," and "Crush France!" The first meant to him the solving of the labour problem, the second the return of his iron mines and steelworks.

The first phase of German National Socialism thus was integrated by two things: Hitler's own patriotism and Thyssen's "practical" patriotism. Its nationalism resembled the nationalism of Wilhelmist Germany, except for the new anti-Bolshevik element which was added by the Baltic-born Alfred Rosenberg, the party's expert on foreign politics in its early days. This White Russian, born in Riga of German parentage, served in the Russian Tsarist army, and with his other exiled Russian friends was a sworn enemy of the Bolsheviks.

Rosenberg adopted the nationalistic and expansionist ideas of Thyssen, but tried to breathe the party and the racial doctrines into them. His idea was the creation of a strong German Empire, the Third Reich, which would include all German territories, "German" being meant in a linguistic as well as a racial sense. Under the Rosenberg scheme, Germany was to regain the Polish Corridor and

Danzig, as well as Posen; it would contain Austria, the German-speaking parts of Switzerland, the German parts (western) of Hungary, as well as Holland and the Flanders parts of Belgium. Czechoslovakia with its four million German population was also scheduled to be included in Rosenberg's Third Reich. In addition, Luxembourg and Denmark were to be incorporated into Germany, and Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein recovered. On the other hand, Norway, Sweden, and Finland were to form a northern Teutonic federation which would either join the Third Reich, or be a kind of protectorate, or at least closely co-operate with the Reich, politically and economically. The Baltic countries were to be incorporated into the Reich as Baltic dominions. South-eastern Europe and the Balkans were to become German protectorates. And, last but not least, an "independent" Ukraine was to be created by detaching it from Russia. It was to contain the Ukrainian parts of Czechoslovakia (Podkarpatska Russ), and furthermore the Ukrainian parts of Polish Galicia, Bukovina, then in Rumanian possession, and the forty-four million Ukrainians of Soviet Russia.

This last part of the scheme was the pet idea of Rosenberg. He wanted a large-scale German colonization in the Ukraine. Why have far-distant colonies? Germany needed "colonies" which were within her reach and which she could protect by the might of her powerful army. As late as 1933 Rosenberg wrote, "The basis of regeneration to our folk is to give to the German rural population freedom in the east" (meaning Russia), and he added that the colonization of the eastern area was Germany's primary problem.

This Rosenberg plan, envisaging the disruption of

Bolshevik Russia, caused many of the ruling personalities in Great Britain to show increasing sympathy for the newly arrived Nazi régime. The detachment of the Ukraine from the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics would not only have robbed Russia of her iron-ore supplies, but cut her off from the oil and petroleum of Baku. It did not occur to these gentlemen that if Russia lost the Ukrainian iron-ore deposits Germany would get them, and thus would be able to complete her rearmament against the Western nations. The possessing classes in France and Britain saw only the anti-Bolshevik part of this programme. Moreover, the "colonization" of the "independent" or "autonomous" Ukraine would mean that Germany would renounce the creation of a new colonial empire in Africa or overseas.

To encourage these sympathies with Nazi Germany in England and France, German foreign policy was temporarily altered; attacks against France were suppressed in the Press and in speeches. Bolshevism was now singled out as an arch-enemy, and Hitler repeatedly assured France that he had no territorial aims in the West, which meant the apparent renunciation of Alsace-Lorraine.

All this encouraged the pro-Nazis in England and France, later better known as the "appeasers," to speak more openly in favour of a *rapprochement* of the Western Powers and Germany. J. L. Garvin of the *Observer* openly and *The Times* more discreetly, began to ask if it was worth while to go to war because of Czechoslovakia or anything on the Continent. Baldwin stated that Great Britain's frontier was on the Rhine, but this also meant that she was not ready to accept any engagement east of the Rhine.

The power of Rosenberg began to fade by 1934 and 1935; his eclipse marked the rise of Herr Joachim von Ribbentrop, who was made first Hitler's ambassador-at-large, and later on Foreign Minister. Von Ribbentrop, from the very beginning, hated Britain. His reports to Hitler interpreted this readiness of the British propertied classes for a compromise with Nazi Germany not as a sign of growing friendship, but as one of increasing weakness in the democracies. Friedrich Sieburg, the correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* in Paris, and Otto Abetz, the two chief agents of von Ribbentrop in France, reported similarly the decay of French society and emphasized the weakness of France.

For some time, however, the old Rosenberg policy was maintained. Russia and Bolshevism remained the chief "enemy." Von Ribbentrop's endeavours were directed toward the formation of an anti-Communist international, and the anti-Comintern pacts with Italy and Japan were its results. France was still reassured that Germany had no territorial aims in the West. In occasional speeches, Hitler referred to Germany's demand for the return of the colonies, but this was considered more a pressure to obtain a free hand from Britain in eastern Europe than an actual demand for immediate colonial possessions.

It was the occupation of Austria in 1938 that caused the first changes in this policy. The world reaction to the occupation was very unfavourable, and the chorus of the Liberal Press all over Europe and America caused much uneasiness in Germany. The Flandins and the Lavals, the Baudouins and Noels in France, and all the "Cliveden" clique in Britain might still be for Germany's eastern policy, but an overwhelming part of public opinion

was against the conquest of these small nations. Would this public opinion not force the Governments of France and Britain to side with one of the victimized countries?

Day after day the German general staff advocated avoiding any complications which might bring a two-front war to Germany's frontiers. And Hitler and von Ribbentrop came to the conclusion that they would probably have to make up their feud with Russia. If any conquest in eastern Europe should cause a war with Russia, England and France might be forced by their "popular front" Governments to join in, and then Germany would be involved in a two-front war. France and Britain could not ultimately and definitely be bribed to abstain from attacking; under the democratic system of government public opinion can force a country into war even if the ruling class is against such a course. On the other hand, Russia was a totalitarian State and one could buy Russia's neutrality—at a price.

Hitler's conversations with Chamberlain at Godesberg, Berchtesgaden and Munich during the Czech crisis in the autumn of 1938 convinced the Fuehrer that a conflict with the West was unavoidable. As he had to carry through his promises concerning the abolition of the Versailles Treaty and the creation of a Greater Germany—the nationalist motto of the Nazi Party—it seemed necessary to revise the old plan. And the Rosenberg plan was abandoned for the von Ribbentrop plan: Britain and France, and not Russia, became the enemy.

Feelers were issued to find out the price of Russian neutrality. Nationalist Russia was ready to compromise on Poland. But Stalin had aims in the Baltic. Now Finland and Estonia were in the pocket of Germany, which had been using them as tools in Rosenberg's plans against

Russia. Under German influence, the Finns had asked for permission to fortify the Aaland Islands, a measure directed to bottling up Russia in the Gulf of Finland, while Estonia had been counselled to fortify the islands of Hiiumaa (Dagoe) and Saaremaa (Oesel), which would complete the bottling up of the Russian Baltic fleet. But when concessions to Russia became necessary, the Germans betrayed their small Baltic friends. Also, Russia wanted Bessarabia. Germany had assured this province that it would be part of Rosenberg's new "independent" Ukraine, but it too was sacrificed.

Thus, as we have seen, von Ribbentrop's first offer for a non-aggression pact with Russia in October, 1938, included a division of Poland and promised Finland and Estonia as spheres of interest to Russia. But by the time the Polish conflict was nearing its height, Russia used blackmail and von Ribbentrop promised her all the Baltic countries and Bessarabia.

Incidentally, this von Ribbentrop plan was a complete break with Rosenberg's, and a reversion to Thyssen's original idea. But by the time Hitler had reverted to Thyssen's plan, its originator was an exile in France. . . . The mills of history grind slowly but surely.

The German army and navy opposed this revolutionary move of von Ribbentrop; Grand Admiral Raeder protested violently and declared that he could no longer guarantee the defence of eastern Prussia if Lithuania went to Russia. But, most important of all, the choice of this plan represented that between respectability and revolution. Rosenberg's anti-Bolshevism had given a certain sham respectability to the Nazi régime. But when he adopted the von Ribbentrop plan and thus broke with the West, Hitler

chose revolution. Goebbels and Himmler supported this choice.

Nevertheless, Hitler's animosity against Russia went on almost to the end. Even in the spring of 1939, when General Walther von Fritsch advocated alliance with Russia, he answered:

"An alliance between Germany and Russia would not only by the signal for war; it would be the beginning of the end of Germany."

Furthermore, this revolutionary step was not made for the sake of the revolution itself, although the influence of the revolutionary and Socialist wing of the party was steadily increasing. It was probably utilitarianism, or rather Machiavellianism, that induced Hitler to make up his feud with Russia. He broke with the West in order to carry out his nationalist programme: the reconquest of unredeemed "German" territories, such as the Polish Corridor and Alsace-Lorraine, in order to regain one million Germans for the Reich in Poland, and almost twice as many "Germans" in the former Alsace-Lorraine. With the defeat of France, the nationalist part of the Rosenberg programme was almost completed. Austria was incorporated into the Reich in 1938, the Sudetenlands in the autumn of 1938, while Bohemia and Moravia became German protectorates in the spring of 1939. In the autumn of 1939 the Germans in Poland and the Polish Corridor were regained; in July, 1940, Alsace-Lorraine was reincorporated into the Reich, and Luxembourg, which the possessors of power in Berlin call a German land, was also made part and parcel of the Reich. . . . The Greater German Reich was thus created.



The nationalist side of the three National Socialist revolutions, however, is more complicated. Nationalism is not meant strictly in the sense of the nineteenth-century liberals. Italy's recent aggression intended to complete the union of all Italians by incorporating the former French possessions of Corsica, Nice, and Savoy. This is nationalism pure and simple in the old Garibaldian sense. But as we saw, all three have nationalist aims beyond that, in which nationalism is taking imperialistic forms.

Nineteenth-century nationalism claimed the right of national independence for all nations, big and small. Twentieth-century revolutionary nationalism permits this right of united nationality only to large nations, while the small ones must become parts of empires ruled by united large nations.

Thus Italy, besides completing her nineteenth-century Garibaldian nationalism, has added to it the conception of the Roman Empire. Besides the *Unita Italia*, the united Italy, there is the superstructure of Roman nationalism in the sense of a re-created Roman Empire. Many will contest that this is nationalism. But this imperialism is a kind of super-nationalism, to which we have to get accustomed.

We had one such super-nationalism before, the British one. Was Joseph Chamberlain only an imperialist? No, he was a British nationalist. British nationalism becomes one in a wider sense, not based exactly on racial or purely linguistic grounds.

Hitler's nationalism has already re-created Greater Germany. But there is a Hitlerian super-nationalism which tries to re-create the old Holy Roman Empire of the German language. This is also a kind of nationalism. Hitler's conception of the Roman Empire of German language is

paralleled by Stalin's newly resuscitated empire of Peter the Great.

The revolutions have brought a new apparition into our life (or made it wider, because the British Empire with its English nationalism and its separate British nationalism is a living example of it, and the old Roman Empire was its forerunner), and have caused the reconstruction of Europe on a queer new nationalistic line, consisting of the nationalism proper of the conquering great Power, and the pseudo- or super-nationalism imposed on the subject races, making these new empires a mixture of national and universal States. Before Germany conquered the territories where her nationals were living in large numbers, her expansive nationalism was called pan-Germanism. Now, subjecting other races to her rule and attempting to impose her language over them, her nationalism in the new empire must be described as national imperialism. Or imperialist nationalism!

## Chapter 16

### WHEN "GANGSTERS" CO-OPERATE

#### THE ELEMENTS OF FUTURE CLASHES BETWEEN THE REVOLUTIONS

IF I call the three leaders of National Socialism in Germany, Russia and Italy "gangsters," I have to qualify my words. Otto D. Tolischus, of the *New York Times*, in his book *They Wanted War*, rightly remarks, "Hitler is no mere gangster leader, as mistaken propaganda pictures him. There is a far better clue to the Hitlerian strength in Germany than the too simple explanation that Germany is ruled by a gang with guns."

Tolischus is right. You cannot keep down sixty to seventy million people just by a mere gang with revolvers. If, however, I call the dictators "gangsters," it is because their international methods are that of the racketeers. Their only argument is force and the revolver; there is no moral basis for any of their actions, and the end sanctifies the means.

For a long time it was believed that this gangsterism was the privilege of the ruling clique of the revolutionary régime in each of the three countries. But with the passing years the armies of these countries have been so purged that the armed forces and their leaders have become silent or open partners of the possessors of power. The corps of German generals is no longer the old respected army

leaders of the last war, with the traditional spirit and manners of the Reichswehr; the German army has become as revolutionary as the Russian army used to be under Trotsky.

Otto Strasser, the German National Socialist, who used to be closely connected with the present rulers in Berlin, until he was forced into exile in 1933, still maintains connections, naturally clandestine, with many important persons in the German Reichswehr and in the Nazi Party. In his recently published book, *Hitler and I*, he quotes the confidential report of an influential friend about the German army:

"The Bolshevik peril has never made any impression on the German militarists. On the contrary: from the point of view of caste, some of them find the Russian system ideal. They know that the ruling class in Russia constitutes a new aristocracy. The ruling group rules, and lives well. Above all, it has power, and a huge apparatus. . . .

"Perhaps we will see the National Bolshevism of Russia and Germany threatening the West from beyond the German frontiers. Then Mr. Chamberlain can have the ideological war that he refused to fight when there was still time. That is the last trump card that the Russo-German Allies have up their sleeve.

"During the last war the generals realized that anti-capitalism might change the face of the world. What would the people say if suddenly monster trials of the big captains of industry were opened, if the factories were expropriated, after their owners had been shot, as they were in Russia? The opposition could be won over by these measures and enslaved to the generals' will. . . . Bolshevism does not constitute a menace to the militarists;

they prefer it to Socialism (meaning social democracy) with its "sickly pacifism." Bolshevism has never been pacifist, but militant and militaristic.

"The generals would regard a German adaptation of Bolshevism as their great opportunity. There are many of them to whom the nature of the régime under which they live matters not a jot, provided only that they can play their rôle."

I knew Strasser well when he was in exile in Prague, and I know how serious and high-placed are his sources of information in Germany. The more important it is that the world should take notice of this *volte-face* amongst the German army leaders. They are for power and for Germany's power in the world, and no methods are cheap or too disgusting for them if they can attain their aim.

Thus the Socialist revolutionaries in the Nazi Party, the Goebbelses, the Himmlers, the Leys, and Darrés, have obtained support and allies in unexpected quarters. The revolution marches to attain world power for Germany.

Moeller van den Bruck, the philosopher of the early Nazi movement, said, "We were Teutons; we are Germans; and we will be Europe."

Hitler is making the German pan-Europe of which this prophet of National Socialism dreamt immediately after the last World War. And the marching song of the German Nazis goes one step further when it says:

Heute gehoert uns Deutschland,  
Morgen die ganze Welt. . . .

(Today we own Germany,  
Tomorrow the whole world. . . .)

Can you see, can you feel, how this expansive Germany made her alliance with Soviet Russia? The Italo-German alliance was born rather as a means to serve an end: it was the co-operation of two ideologically similar régimes where the one feared that the downfall of the other would damage him. The German generals have never taken the Italian alliance seriously; it was regarded by them as an expedient, and only a temporary one at that.

Russia was a more important pawn in the game. Not that Germany is willing to share power with Russia. But for the time being, why not take the attitude of the medieval kings who in their relations with the aristocrats declared themselves to be *primus inter pares*—first among equals? The Nazis pretended that they concluded an alliance of equal partnership with Russia, but feel that they are “first among equals.”

Today they are willing to share power with Russia, until the final victory. Tomorrow they want to defeat the country with whom they conspire to bring down the others. But to gain Russia's co-operation in this game great concessions were to be made to Russia. These concessions were both of territorial and ideological nature. That is why the Socialist and revolutionary ideas of Goebbels and Himmler, Ley and Darré, triumphed in the party, and obtained the support of the generals.

Today they work with Russia; “tomorrow the whole world will be theirs. . . .”

Italy was at first shocked by the Russo-German co-operation, which was brought about without much consultation of this Axis partner. Her excellent secret service was of course well informed about the negotiations which were going on between Russia and Germany; but Ciano

must have been annoyed, because the scanty information which he had direct from Berlin was given with the apparent intention of duping Italy about the true nature of the negotiations.

This explains why at the beginning of the war in September, 1939, Italy showed no enthusiasm for Hitler's war. Ciano, in a speech delivered in Rome in December, revealed that the German general staff considered that Germany should have waited five years to be completely rearmed before trying a war with the West. During the Finnish-Russian War Italy demonstrated her sympathies toward Finland by sending aeroplanes and volunteers to help her gallant fight against the overwhelming forces of Soviet Russia. But after the Brenner meeting between Hitler and Mussolini in March, 1940, the situation suddenly changed. The Italian Press was no longer hostile to Russia and began to speak about the co-operation of the "have-nots," and later of the "proletarian States."

Poor old Marx, who coined the phrase, "Proletarians, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!" He must be turning in his grave at this profanation of his slogan.

Nevertheless, one must not believe that the co-operation between the three dictatorships is whole-hearted or that it is proceeding undisturbed.

The co-operation between the three totalitarian States came about because they were all revolutionary, because they were all totalitarian and authoritarian, and because they were pulled nearer to one another by their existing economic and social systems. If the co-operation came about on Socialist grounds, they are bound to clash on

nationalist lines. While we should not let ourselves be deluded by false optimism, it is essential to watch carefully the lines of cleavage which may develop between the three dictatorial régimes.

The potential clashes inherent in their nationalisms are manifold, and they all originate on national lines. Obviously! All three régimes are expansive and imperialistic; two of them seek world power, while the third, Italy, seeks transcontinental power. In their rivalries they remind one of gangsters. During the era of prohibition in the United States the various moonshiners and smuggling racketeers were fighting each other. But if the police became too violent against one of the bands, the others suspended hostilities and all three warred against the police. So it is with the dictatorial States. At present the totalitarian "racketeers" intend to finish with the "police," that is the democratic States, who represent law and order and a society based on a certain morality. They attempt to finish this police before the continue their own war against each other, but in the meantime they try to abolish all divergences. The question is, How long can this co-operation last without permitting the latent differences to come to the surface?

Both Germany and Russia seek world power. Germany intends to gain this by creating a mighty pan-Europe, and then subjecting the others to its control. Russia intended to gain world power by spreading Bolshevism to other States, and thus creating countries with similar Governments which then would be ruled from Moscow, just as the Communist parties abroad are ruled from the Kremlin.

Already this endeavour to obtain world power is bound to bring Germany and Russia to a clash. But there are



territorial rivalries which must also bring clashes between the two mighty States, even if today everything is done to bury the hatchet.

When in 1937 I warned that Russia and Germany would find each other, I also prophesied that they were bound to clash later on. I recalled the story of a similar agreement between Russia and Austria—and Greater Germany is now the heir of Austria!

I wrote: "Russia and her mortal enemy Austria made up the bitter feud in 1903. When it appeared that only war could settle the differences between Vienna and Moscow, the Tsar of Russia and the Emperor of Austria met in Muerzsteg, in a small hunting lodge of Emperor Francis Joseph; and there was signed the famous agreement which divided the spheres of interests of the two empires in Central and south-eastern Europe. Austria was to continue her penetration in the western Balkans, Russia in the eastern parts of that peninsula. But in 1908 a serious crisis arose between the two at the time of the annexation of Bosnia, and six years later the World War ended the agreement of the emperors.

"The Berlin-Moscow Axis, if it ever comes, can also establish only a makeshift arrangement. If the two big dictatorships decide to divide their spheres of interests (should they ever conclude peace with each other), then the arrangement probably will be similar to the Muerzsteg agreement. . . . But just as Austria and Russia could not agree about Bosnia, so Russia and Germany are bound to clash about the Bosphorus."

And I remarked, "Pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism are real forces if they are ever let loose. . . ."

And pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism are let loose

today. Hitler's mighty Greater Germany not only covets the "unredeemed Germans" of Hungary, Transylvania, and Jugoslavia, but has other expansionist aims. And Stalin, the heir of Peter the Great, not only has revived the pan-Slavism of old Russian days, and in the Balkans uses his influence as ruler of "Mother Russia" with the Jugoslavs and the Bulgarians, but covets other aims such as Constantinople, the dream of Peter, as well as Sweden, once coveted by the same Tsar.

Another prediction of mine, that Germany and Russia may clash on the Bosphorus, holds good even today. It will be remembered that the Thyssen plan of the German imperialists, later incorporated in the Rosenberg plan, contemplated the revival of the Hamburg-Berlin-Baghdad push, to acquire the resources of south-eastern Europe and the Near East for the German war and peace economics. Under the von Ribbentrop plan, the Berlin-Baghdad scheme had to be pushed back because any move in the Balkans would revive rivalries with both Russia and Italy.

When the German-Russian pact was concluded in August, 1939, Germany hoped to obtain large supplies of raw materials from the Soviets. But we have seen that Russian production is falling and that Russia herself needs imports. Otto Tolischus points out that even as late as November, 1939, the German Press was presenting a rosy picture of Russian supplies to Germany, but strictly military observers and publications were increasingly sceptical.

Tolischus quoted a lecture of Colonel Ritter von Niedermayer before the Cologne Geographic Society, in which the Colonel summarized the reasons for caution concerning Russian supplies: first, Russia's own industrial-

zation, which increased Russian consumption of raw materials; second, the breakdown of transportation. According to Niedermayer, while Russian production increased 250 per cent, railroad facilities increased only 48 per cent; while passenger traffic rose 600 per cent, the number of locomotives increased only 48 per cent. Even concerning Russian supplies of agricultural produce and future exports to Germany, the Colonel was pessimistic because collectivized Russian agriculture depended on tractors which in turn lacked fuel.

Russia's inability to supply Germany with a number of raw materials, especially with oil and petroleum, has already caused army circles and the Nazi Party to feel bound to revise their Russian policy. While for ideological reasons and for the sake of the co-operation of the revolutionaries against the capitalists it is considered essential to continue co-operation with Russia, grave doubts are now entertained whether this will continue to be expedient.

Petroleum is the blood of the modern industrial system. Germany needs oil and petrol not only for her army, for her motorized and armoured columns, for her aviation, but for reconstruction in the countries she has conquered. Where can she get it?

It is true that by the occupation of France, Belgium, and Holland, Germany captured large stores of oil which relieved her immediate need. But her oil shortage still remains. Nor are the oil supplies of complaisant Rumania sufficient to keep Hitler's pan-Europe going, even today, and since the Rumanian wells are slowly drying up, production is becoming less every year.

If she can wangle the possession of the Dutch oil wells in Venezuela and in the Dutch East Indies, then all is

well, and the co-operation with Russia may continue. But if she is not able to gain this oil—and she can control these oil wells only if she defeats England—then she will have to look for nearer sources of supply. There are only two of them: the Russian wells in Baku and between the Volga and the Caspian; and the district of Mosul and Iraq.

This may ultimately force Germany to revert to the Rosenberg plan and attempt to “colonize” the Ukraine; in order to control the route to the Russian oil wells which she intends to place in the hands of the “independent” Republics of Daghestan and Azerbadjan, to be created after the conquest of the Ukraine.

The conquest of the Mosul oil wells on the other hand would necessitate the subjugation of Turkey. And the conquest of the Dardanelles is bound to cause a clash between Germany and Russia. Thus both possible ways to acquire oil for the requirements of Greater Germany, and, eventually for Hitler’s Pan-Europe, would bring Germany into clash with Russia.

Russian-German rivalry is also evident in the Baltic. So violent was Grand Admiral Raeder’s protest over the Russian acquisition of the Baltic States that Hitler had to reassure him with a pledge that these provinces would be reconquered for Germany as soon as the Western Powers were defeated. Which promise shows that Hitler himself has in mind a future conflict with Russia.

The interests of the three totalitarian Powers are also in conflict in other parts of the world. Take, for instance, the Mediterranean. Though the Italians have declared this sea as *Mare Nostrum*, Italian interests clash here with German and Russian aims. Soviet Russia, for example, views with great misgivings Italian aspirations in the Eastern

Mediterranean. Soviet Russia has renewed her pan-Slav influence on Bulgaria and Jugoslavia. She sees with distrust Italian ambitions in Greece, Jugoslavia, and Bulgaria. Italy is trying to push into the Western Balkans with the aid of the pan-Albanian movement and develop an agitation on these lines at the expense of both Greece and Jugoslavia. In Bulgaria again Italy tries to make her influence felt through Queen Giovanna, the daughter of King Victor Emmanuel of Italy. Russia watches these moves carefully and is ready to counteract them.

The Russian conquest of Bessarabia has caused further uneasiness both in Germany and Italy over Russia's future aims in south-eastern Europe. Furthermore German and Italian interests undoubtedly clash with Russian interests in Turkey. Russia wants to control the Dardanelles. For her the Dardanelles are the one lung; the other being the islands at the entrance of the Finnish bay which she succeeded in conquering last year. But if the Dardanelles are opened to the Russians (who are now constructing a powerful fleet), then Italy's position in the Eastern Mediterranean would become precarious. For Germany, again, Turkey is important because it could be developed as a source of ore, chromium, magnesite, cotton, and other goods.

German and Italian interests, again, clash in Spain. For the time being the two Powers of the Rome-Berlin axis have made up their Iberian feud, but the rivalry is latent beneath the surface. Benito Mussolini has the ambitious secret scheme of creating a Latin union in the Western Mediterranean. Mussolini was for long a champion of Latin co-operation and when his endeavours succeeded in bringing Italy into the war in 1915 on the side of France,

his chief argument was the Latin sistership! This idea remained strong with him and was revived in 1934 during the Premiership of André Laval in France. Laval offered a friendly hand which Mussolini accepted chiefly because he believed in the possibility of Latin solidarity versus Teuton—British and German—conceit.

The Latin co-operation was frustrated by the forthcoming Abyssinian conflict in which Mussolini found himself betrayed by France. But this did not mean dropping the idea of Latin solidarity. He now thought that France had to be defeated first and then he could create a Latin union of Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal under Rome's leadership and tacit domination.

When after the defeat of France the new Government of Pétain was formed in Vichy, with Laval as Vice-Premier, this was very suitable to Mussolini's aims. Laval was an old protagonist of Latin union; Pétain's connections with Franco only helped these aims!

The Germans, however, watched these tendencies carefully and misapprehensively. Germany has no interest in permitting the inclusion of Spain and Portugal into a Latin union, nor does she wish a close co-operation between Italy and France. And thus German endeavours are now directed to removing the "pro-Latin-union" Laval and Pétain and replacing them by Croix de Feu Fascists who are the tools of Germany.

German Gestapo and Italian secret service are now rivals in Spain. Italy watches with anxiety the endeavours of Germany to oust Franco and the pro-Italian Serrano Suñer from power in Spain and Salazar in Portugal, and to replace them by puppets of Germany. The Nazis have far-reaching aims on the Iberian peninsula, especially in

## WHEN "GANGSTERS" CO-OPERATE

relation with the new world. The control of Spain may give them a key to South America!

Can these divergences between the three important totalitarian States be alleviated or can an open clash be averted until the co-operation of the three "proletarian" countries has achieved a victory over the capitalist countries? This depends on many things. An incident anywhere in these contested spheres of interest may be the spark to the explosion. The countries who feel menaced by this co-operation should, however, carefully study the events and apply the necessary counter-measures by exploiting these divergences in their own favour.

## Chapter 17

### THE REVOLUTION AND THE NEW WORLD

THE joint action of the three totalitarian States has succeeded in smashing at least one of the big European democracies: France. In the autumn of 1940 the Germans were still busy assailing Britain. Let us consider what would happen if Great Britain should succumb to this attack (which God forbid!). Undoubtedly the next victims on the schedule would be the two Americas.

This attack on the New World would come not only because of lust of power and desire for conquest: Its cause would probably be ideological. Even if Hitler, thanks to his widespread conquests, could improve the standard of living of his own people and reduce the working hours of his labour-slaves, at present infamously long, the totalitarian pan-Europe would be based on something which fundamentally amounts to slave labour. Although European nations, through their timidity and comfort-loving idleness, may have contributed to their own enslavement. Byron almost prophetically visualized this when he said:

Self-abasement paved the way  
To villain bonds and despot sway.

Yet slaves, for many thousands of years, have always revolted.

The totalitarian States can maintain their oppressive



régimes for any length of time only if there is left in the world no major country which champions human rights.

The dictators know quite well that ideas can be as dangerous, especially in the long run, as tanks or aeroplanes. You may forbid people to read foreign papers, you may prohibit their listening to broadcasts from abroad, and yet somehow ideas find their way to the souls of the slaves.

To abolish this freedom of thought, the principle of individual liberty, of human rights—in one word, everything for which Washington, Jefferson, and Hamilton stood, and which might have a corrupting influence on the German slaves at home and on Germany's helots in other countries—the dictators probably would be obliged to challenge the New World. This attack naturally would come under some well-sounding shibboleth which Goebbels would invent and propagandize with his usual sagacity and vigour!

What forms would this attack take? The plans are well prepared; they will vary according to the geography, the ethnography, the internal situation, and the international connections of the various States. On the military side, the attack on the North American continent would be concentrated on Canada and the United States. Should Britain be defeated, she would be forced to hand over her fleet to Germany. This would bring the German, Italian, and Japanese navies to a great superiority over that of the United States. Germany's first move would be to try to obtain sovereignty over Greenland, using the pretext that Denmark is a German protectorate. This would bring Germany only four hundred miles from Baffin Island (which is part of Canada), and only a score of miles from

Canada at Smith Sound. It is interesting that repeated German expeditionary enterprises have been directed toward Greenland. It was in the 1930's that Professor Wegener perished on one of his transcontinental exploration trips in Greenland, and other German scientists took over his task later on. The famous German flyer Udet (who, by the way, organized for the German army the parachute weapon) made repeated flights across Greenland. These exploration trips and flights were undoubtedly of scientific value, but the Nazis also used them for obtaining information about Greenland to suit future plans.

Once the Germans had Greenland, they would attempt to extend their rule to Canada. To attain this aim they would try to organize not only the French-speaking Canadians (using the puppet French Government as a tool), but also the other foreign elements as possible Fifth Columnists when *der Tag* comes!

Conquest of Canada would give Germany a three-thousand-mile frontier with the United States. Once established in Canada, with its eleven million population, the German motorized army units could attack this country wherever they wished.

The attack on the United States would come not only from Canada. The Germans contemplate obtaining important vantage points in South America from which they could make air raids against this country, landing troops by large Junker troop-carrying planes as well as by parachute. We shall analyse later the South American plans of the Germans. But to conquer the United States the Germans contemplate using Fifth Columns as well as other methods of internal disruption.

Colin Ross, an important German writer and travelling

journalist, said in his book, *Unser Amerika*, in 1937 that Anglo-Saxon superiority in the United States is pure fiction. The German missionary Peter Minnewit helped to found New York; German pioneers arrived on the ship *Concord* only sixty years after the *Mayflower*; German colonists fought for America's freedom; German generals helped Washington's victory; German pioneers conquered the West. One starts to gasp! Reading Colin Ross's book, one would believe that everything in this country was done by Germans.

Herr Ross then comes to the conclusion that this present Anglo-Saxon-ruled system of government is unjust, that the present division on a basis of federal States is purely artificial and should be replaced by regrouping on a racial basis. Thus the Germans should have their own home rule, the Italians also, etc. This would enable the Germans to play a new rôle in America, according to their number, importance, ability, and influence, writes Ross. What a wonderful chance to build a perfect Fifth Column! The German Bund is already a State within the State; this programme would then just hand over America to it, as the Sorelian-Fascist principle clearly suggests that the most determined minority is bound to gain the power! Ross's suggestion would enable the conquest of America without a shot—just by the sheer weight of the Fifth Column.

The Bund is trying to put the ideas of the Nazi writer into practice; a powerful organization of Germans is already being brought into existence in the U.S.A., which, aided by agents sent from Germany, and directed clandestinely by the Embassy, and even more by various Consulates, would be of great aid to the German armies if they should once decide on an invasion from Canada.

The Germans are very busy in other ways, too. Besides the territorial and aerial menace, besides this internal-disruption process, they are using other Fifth Column methods to weaken American resistance: pacifism and pleas for neutrality, economic threats, and also economic promises. As they convinced the Sir Samuel Hoares, the Sir John Simons, the Neville Chamberlains in England, the Lavals, the Baudouins, the Deats in France, the Socialists and Catholics in Holland and Belgium, that their intentions were peaceful, they would like to convince the people of the United States that rearmament is a waste of money, and compulsory military service unnecessary. Many *bona-fide* Americans do not realize that their own pacifism or opposition to proper rearmament causes intense joy and satisfaction in Berlin because it makes *der Tag* easier! For while they encourage American pacifism, and hope that the efforts of the Lindberghs, Vandenberghs, and Wheelers will prevent efficient defence measures from being adopted, the Germans are preparing feverishly for the coming assault. We can already hear the siren song of peace. Funk and other important German functionaries have declared that Germany wants peace with the United States. Herr Hitler, and also Marshal Goering, in interviews given to the well-known American correspondent, Karl von Wiegand, stated that Germany entertained no hostile intentions against the United States and that the new pan-Europe (German-controlled) would live in peace and friendship with America. Germany promises peace if America keeps neutral. Naturally, because her "complete" neutrality would hasten the downfall of Great Britain.

Another method of German appeasement is the sending over of important commercial agents or using the resident

commercial emissaries (*vide* Westrick) to convince business circles that friendship with Germany means peace and prosperity for the United States.

No doubt, for a short time Germany would like to see more intensive commercial relations with the United States. She needs at present many raw materials which she expects later on to gain from her newly conquered possessions and "protectorates," but which cannot at present be exploited, owing to lack of means and communications and to war conditions in Germany. She needs especially oil, petroleum, and octane petrol, and furthermore copper, tin, chromium, and other goods which she expects to obtain from or via America. But this she wants only until she succeeds in defeating Britain and is able to reorganize the resources of occupied territories or of territories to be occupied in the future by German troops and business men.

Besides the preparations for military and Fifth Column assaults, Germany is carefully drafting her schemes for an economic assault on the Americas. In the event of Britain's defeat, Germany, on pattern of the Versailles Treaty, would confiscate all the French and British holdings and investments. We have seen in Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as in Austria, how Germany converted the foreign-owned plants and companies into German-owned or German-controlled organizations. This would cause a tremendous change in financial and economic control, not only in Europe and Africa, but also in other continents.

First, Germany would probably become the owner of Canada's important resources and companies. Controlling Canada, Germany could get not only plenty of grain and meat to feed her own population, but also ample fodder

for the cattle in the conquered States of Bohemia, Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium. Moreover, Canada's immense mineral wealth has yet been hardly touched; her copper, nickel, cobalt, asbestos, and oil resources would be exploited by the Germans, and efficient industries created on the frontier of the United States would further complicate trade relations.

The important whaling industry of the world would get almost entirely into the hands of the Germans, who have already defeated three of the important whale-fishing countries, Holland, Denmark, and Norway.

The subjugation of Holland, after the establishment of peace, would affect American economics tremendously. Rubber and tin came mostly from the Dutch East Indies, while the possession of the Dutch West Indies by Germany would not only bring her much coveted oil and petroleum, but also assure her naval bases in Willemstad, Curaçao, very near the Panama Canal.

Moreover, a consolidated and well-organized pan-European economic unit would be created; against such efficient competition high-tariff barriers are no panacea—at least not for long. America would be forced to trade on Germany's terms; nay more, at Germany's mercy. And even this trade would probably be on the well-known principle of barter, and not an exchange of goods in the old mercantile sense.

The adoption of this barter system, in turn, would lead to the elimination of gold as a means of payment. The nineteen billion dollars' worth of gold hoarded in Kentucky would lose its value. The right-hand man of General Goering, Germany's economic dictator, Doctor Walther Funk, has already warned that if America is not

more complaisant to Germany's economic wishes, she will have the means and ways to demonetize America's gold!

The German plans for expansion are by no means restricted to North America. The rich resources of South America have always been a great temptation to Germany.

German agents are everywhere at work in South America. Nazi policy tries to gain a foothold wherever it can. It exploits internal difficulties in most of the States, and as the Central and South American Republics are often ruled by juntas of officers, or by other revolutionaries, dissatisfaction is already great amongst the population. German policy in South and Central America is double-barrelled: first, it tries to create unrest everywhere and bring into office régimes which sympathize with Nazi Germany; second, it attempts to control the southern and south-western sector of South America, including the Argentine, Chile, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and possibly Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. The others then would be allied to her by looser connections.

The Argentine is important to Germany because of its grain, fodder, and cattle production, and because its large undeveloped territories may provide settlement possibilities for German emigrants. Chile is important because of her copper production. In 1937 Chile produced 396,400 metric tons of copper, that is, half of the production reached in the United States and four times as much as Russia's. The rich nitrate mines of Chile are less important to Germany because she has introduced at home a large production of artificial nitrates. Moreover, the provinces of Atocoma and Coquimba contain huge iron-ore deposits estimated at one billion tons, which is larger than the capacity of the German Lorraine mines. Uruguay is impor-

tant to Germany only because it still provides settlement possibilities for emigrants and because it is the connecting link between Argentine and the Germans in the Brazilian provinces of São Paulo and Rio Grande del Sul.

Bolivia is coveted because of her tin mines; Peru because of her still unexploited mineral riches and oil—this country has vanadium and other rare metals important in armament manufacture. Ecuador has great possibilities because of her mineral wealth and oil, while Colombia, long-coveted settlement place for Germans, has emeralds, gold, copper, silver, lead, mercury, manganese, etc.

Everywhere in these countries German Nazi groups, acting as Fifth Columns, are trying to enlarge and emphasize existing dissension. German Nazi agitation has proceeded indeed very far in many Central and South American countries. General Julio A. Rolletti, Minister of Defence of the Uruguay Government, disclosed on August 13, 1940, that the Nazis had planned a *Putsch* in Uruguay in the preceding June. German Nazi machinations in Guatemala are also very far-reaching.

German agents are extremely active in Mexico, Brazil, Peru, and Chile, and naturally in Colombia as well as Bolivia. In the latter country Captain Roehm, until his execution in June, 1934, the leader of the Nazi storm troops, was military instructor of the army.

The Germans, however, have an even more far-reaching and unified aim in South America. This scheme is as ingenious as it is diabolical and malicious: the Nazis suggest to the Spanish Nazis, or Nazi sympathizers, that Spain should regain her place as a Great Power. They not only suggest to Spain that she retake Gibraltar and promise her French Morocco, but they say: you, great Spanish nation,



you were robbed of your overseas possessions by the Anglo-Saxons; first the British and later the Americans. You conquered Spanish America: you are entitled to the southern continent of America by linguistic and racial ties." (Brazil in the same way is promised to the Portuguese Nazis.)

While the Germany of Hitler offers this bait to Spain, she is taking good care that the "privilege" of reconquering the heritage of the Emperors Charles V and Maximilian I should not go to "unfit" or "unfriendly" hands.

The present Spanish Government is certainly not *persona grata* with Berlin. Power is divided between a junta of seven generals and the Spanish Traditionalist Falangist Party, whose chief is the Premier Ramon Serrano Suñer. Rome likes Suñer, who is the brother-in-law of the *Caudillo* (General Franco). But Berlin distrusts him. The Nazis of Germany do not like the Mussolini plan of a Latin union—Rome-controlled—in the Mediterranean. They want to boss Spain (and Portugal), and they do not want to share power either with Italy or with Franco. They want to make a synthesis of the pro-German (and not the pro-Italian) wing of the Falangist Party and the pro-German generals. If their *coup* succeeds, then the world will see a new propaganda achievement and a novel kind of drive in South America. Berlin will start a Spanish *irredenta* movement in South America, demanding a federation, like the United States of North America, amongst the Central and South American republics, and then they will become the boss, unseen, but all the more real, of this union.

The United States and the two Americas must be prepared to meet any such German attack. They must improve

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

their defences and organize a joint resistance. Material defence, however, is not sufficient without spiritual preparedness, because a revolutionary movement, such as is represented by the European dictatorships, cannot be defeated by the sword alone.

## Chapter 18

### RELIGION AND THE REVOLUTION

REVOLUTIONS often prove to be enemies of established religions. The most radical phase of the French Revolution attempted to incorporate into its laws Rousseau's ideas concerning the Reign of Virtue; and the law of *Prairial* introduced Rousseau's ideas of the Deity in the form of the Supreme Being. The Convention, indeed, had to recognize the existence of the "Supreme Being and the Immortality of the Soul." On June 8, 1794, a festival was held in the honour of the new religion in Paris.

A few months earlier, the Worship of Reason had been introduced, and on November 10, 1793, Notre-Dame cathedral was converted into the "Temple of Reason," where the actress Madame Maillard appeared as the "Goddess of Reason." In the later stage Robespierre became the supreme pontiff of the new religion.

Similarly the conspiracies of the Carbonari in Italy were directed against the established Catholic Church; the revolutions of 1830 and 1848 showed ideas which apparently were initiated by freemasons who assailed the power of the Roman Catholic Church wherever they could.

Other revolutions, like the peasant revolt in Rumania and the revolution in Russia in 1905, have shown another feature quite common in the revolutions of our age: the persecution of the Jews. The established Greek Orthodox

Churches in both countries succeeded in diverting attacks on themselves by pushing the rising peasants into anti-semitic excesses, which resulted in the pogroms of 1905, both in Rumania and Russia.

The present revolutionary wave attacking the traditional ways of our life constitutes a serious challenge not only to the capitalistic economic and financial system, to the existing classes, and to the prevailing thoughts and cultures, but also a serious challenge to and defiance of the established churches. Whether Christian, Mohammedan, Jewish, or Buddhist, the churches represent nowadays traditional and conservative thought. This is not an essential characteristic of religion or of faith; Jesus Christ Himself was the greatest social revolutionary of history, while Mohammedanism, which in the beginning was a faith, became in its later stages a great revolutionary and imperialistic force.

Today all established churches have become a traditional and conserving force, except the Shintoism of the Japanese, which is not so much a religion proper as a kind of patriotic expression of life, preserving ancient rites but encouraging national grandeur and expansion.

Here lies the great failure of our society. Christianity has become a kind of pacifist ideology because the Ten Commandments said, "Thou shalt not kill!" The tragedy of the churches was that they overemphasized this pacifist credo. While the unscrupulous enemies of religion, the present revolutionary movements, were using the sword as well as propaganda in spreading their atheist or anti-church dogmas, the established churches withdrew into an "unarmed" defensive attitude and were slowly eaten up piecemeal by the assailers.

## RELIGION AND THE REVOLUTION

Especially is this true concerning the Roman Catholic Church, which formerly was an expansive and militant church. Not only did the Catholic Church organize crusades, leading to various imperialistic conquests, in the Middle Ages, but the Church of Rome used to have its own secular State, which was abolished only in 1870 when Garibaldi conquered Rome. The papacy of the Middle Ages waged many wars.

Even if the Roman Catholic Church has not been out-and-out pacifistic in recent years, it has tried constantly to solve the European problems by peaceful intervention of the Pope—unfortunately at a period when the Nazi revolution had already proceeded too far unchecked in its triumphal conquest.

The established churches had already received a bad blow with the coming of the revolutions of 1917-18. In Russia the fall of Tsardom and the rise of the Bolsheviks almost completely destroyed the power of the Russian Orthodox Church, once one of the most powerful institutions in Russia. Churches today may be open in Russia and a few priests still celebrate masses, but the cult of atheism is encouraged openly by the State, and one of the finest churches in Moscow has been converted into an atheist museum.

In Germany the revolution of 1918 seriously affected, at least temporarily, the life of the churches. The Social Democrats in Berlin and Munich openly encouraged "free-thinking," that is, a break with established religions, and encouraged their followers to study rationalistic books and philosophy. Darwin, Boelsche, Haeckel with his monism, became the "prophets" of the Social-Democratically organized masses in Germany. The same was

true in Austria and to some extent in Czechoslovakia, especially in the Bohemian and Moravian parts.

In Hungary the Bolshevik régime of Bela Kun introduced atheistic tendencies as in Russia and started a persecution of the priests and of the Church. But the counter-revolution of the Whites, which was engineered with the help amongst others of the Roman Catholic Church (Father Bela Bangha played an especially important rôle in this direction), could never re-establish the power of the Church in quite as firm a position as it held before the revolution of 1918-19.

The further course of the revolutions caused new perils to the churches. The terror in Russia became worse and worse with the passing years, though it spent its force around 1928, from which period on the persecution of the priests was not so severe as in the past, yet the anti-Church and atheist tendency of the revolution remained.

Mussolini's Fascism in Italy did not curtail the power of the Church to the extent that occurred in Russia, but the retirement of the Roman Catholic Church behind the narrow walls of the Vatican probably symbolizes the shrinking power of its religion. The political power of the Church—clericalism—was completely smashed in Italy by Fascism. For Roman Catholicism was a considerable political power there before the rise of Fascism, but the Fascist fighting squads soon humiliated and dispersed the followers of Don Sturdzo's Popolari—People's Party. The priest Don Sturdzo himself did not enjoy immunity and suffered from the insults and threats of the Fascist beating-squads. The Lateran Treaty of 1929, signed by Cardinal Gasparri on behalf of Pope Pius XI and by Signor Mussolini on behalf of King Victor Em-

manuel, recognized the *status quo*; it not only deprived the Church of all political influence and activities in Italy, but handed over the education of the youth to Fascist hands—one of the biggest blows received by the Catholic Church in the third decade of our century.

National Socialism also revived the persecution of the churches, surpassing all the other revolutions in its anti-clerical attitude. The “godless” in Russia have an enormous organization, but there were only a few instances of organized violation of the sanctity of the churches. In Germany not only Christians but Christianity is being persecuted. In Russia the hammer and sickle does not adorn the altar. In Germany the swastika—the hooked cross—is now placed over the altar of the churches.

Hitler's National Socialism attacked the churches for various reasons. First, he, probably, rightly attributed too much pacifism to all the churches. Hitler's motto is, “Thou shalt learn to kill!” Second, he attributes too much internationalism to the churches. Thus the Roman Catholic Church recognizes the sovereignty of someone else than the actual head of the National Socialist State. Protestant churches keep close together all over the world. These manifestations of internationalism are in clear contradiction to the jingo-nationalist spirit of the Nazi régime. Third, Hitler's racial theory is in clear contradiction with the teaching of all the Christian churches. Already in his *Mein Kampf* Hitler attacked both the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches because they were indifferent to the systematic pollution of Aryan blood by Jews!

Consequently he started a war against the established churches, and even such heroes as the wartime submarine commander Niemoeller, who later became a Protestant

preacher, had to suffer for his faith in concentration camp and prison. At the same time Hitler attempted to build up a new religion for Nazi Germany, or rather, to revive the old pagan religion. Even in his Vienna days, Hitler was a great admirer of Richard Wagner's operas and was deeply impressed by the cult of Wotan and the other Teutonic pagan gods.

In the post-war days Alfred Rosenberg, who wrote the book *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*, gave new encouragement to Hitler's neo-paganistic ideas, and consequently such a course was encouraged amongst the Nazi *élite*. If the motto "One people, one Reich" (the motto of Pan-Germanism) and most of the antisemitic shibboleths of Naziism were borrowed from the vocabulary of the Austrian extremist-nationalist von Schoenerer, many other mottoes such as the greeting "*Heil!*" and the rune script of the party *élite* was borrowed from Wagner.

If racialism is not exactly a question of religion, it is closely connected with it, and originated in the persecution of Judaism, which in the early days of antisemitism was after all a religious manifestation. Zionism was just being born when Hitler was a young man.

The origins of this antisemitism of Hitler's Naziism are obscure and foreign. While racialism has become one of the chief pillars of the German National Socialist structure, the fathers of this queer and wholly unscientific creed were certainly non-German in most cases.

The originator of the "Nordic racial" supremacy idea was Count de Gobineau, a Frenchman. His pseudo-scientific researches impressed another autodidact, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, the English son-in-law of Richard Wagner. It is interesting that Chamberlain dedicated his



book, *The Ideas of the Nineteenth Century*, to Professor Siegmund Wiesner, teacher of botany at Vienna University, declaring that it was to Wiesner that he owed many of his ideas. Professor Wiesner was, by the way, a non-Aryan.

Thus the ideas of a Frenchman, an Englishman, and a Jew were responsible for the origin of the racial theory of the National Socialist Party. It is needless to say that the racial theory is absolutely unscientific, both in its narrower and its wider sense. There exists no pure Germanic race, just as there is no pure English or French race. The Germans, before the foundation of Greater Germany, were a mixture of Saxons, other Teutonic tribes, and various Slavs, as well as of old Asiatic settlers and Celts. Since the inclusion of Austria and the Sudeten lands this mixing of German, Slav, Asiatic, and Celtic blood has become only more intense. It was during the big fight between Schuschnigg's Austria and Hitler's Germany in 1935 that a German professor in Jena, conducting racial research, wrote that the Austrians were one of the most corrupted people, and that they belonged to the so-called Dinarian part of the Germans, a group which had less German blood than the other more "Teutonic" groups.

Count Arthur Polzer-Hoditz thereupon wrote a letter to a leading Vienna Catholic paper in which ironically he expressed his "horror" about the learned professor's discovery. "We are ashamed of having such a corrupted German blood," he wrote, "and our only consolation is that the German Fuehrer belongs to this same badly corrupted race."

The tragedy of the anti-religious attitude of the totalitarian dictators is that all basis of morality has ceased to

## THE REVOLUTION IS ON

exist in their lands. The Roman law gave a basis to "law and order" in the organized societies of pre-war and pre-revolutionary Europe, but the Machiavellianism of Hitler and Mussolini has extirpated this legal basis in the European order. The moral basis was exterminated by the persecution of the churches, the revolutions being unable to replace the old morality, provided either by the teachings of Christ or by the doctrines of other religions, by another new morality. This lack of moral basis in the three revolutions will probably constitute the secret cause of their disintegration. No society in the world has hitherto survived without possessing a certain code of morality and ethics.

## Chapter 19

### THE REVOLUTION MARCHES ON

WE have seen in previous chapters that the present phase of the revolution in Germany, Soviet Russia, and Italy, and even in Japan, is National Socialism. Must we then regard it as the final result of the present revolutionary wave? God forbid!

Under no circumstances do I consider the present phase of the revolution as permanent. This is a convenient half-way (or quarter-of-the-way) house on the long trail of the revolution. When I was lecturing at Dartmouth College, in May, 1938, I said that I thought that the present stage of the revolution could be described as National Socialism, but that we were only one-third or one-fourth of the way down the road of the revolution. The present stage is just a passing emergency solution and the final forms may be something quite different. If, however, National Socialism is not the final form reached by the present revolutionary movement, what is the next step? Or what will be the final development?

This question is difficult to answer because it will depend on many factors, most of which are still in their initial stages, so that their results are by no means visible. One of the factors which will determine the future course of the revolutionary development will be whether Britain survives the assault of Germany on herself and her empire. If she does, the revolution will still meet a divided world—

divided concerning the social and economic structure of society:

Nevertheless, even a completely victorious Britain could no longer return to the old way of life, to the old social habits and economic conditions, to the old form of the capitalist system exercised there before this war. It is not only that the wealth of the country, the earning possibilities, the economic conditions will be affected by the tremendous war expenditure (which from September 1, 1939, to September 1, 1940, amounted to about £2,500,000,000, exclusive of the costs of previous rearmament and the losses suffered through the German blockade against shipping, etc.). As the political and economic upheavals of the Napoleonic days reduced the privileges of the British aristocracy, the present war already is producing a revolutionary change in the social structure and the position of the middle classes in general and of the higher bourgeoisie in particular.

The British class system which was so pronouncedly maintained before the war is being abolished by financial and economic circumstances. Losses on the stock exchange, through the depreciation of British currency and through the elimination of foreign holdings in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, and especially France, have proved to be a vital blow to the propertied class. Costs of living have increased and taxes have risen dangerously. Moreover, people called up for war duties have had to give up their lucrative jobs and do work of national importance for modest salaries. I know, for example, the case of a famous medical doctor whose income had been at least six thousand pounds a year. Called up for army service, he had to live on the pay of a colonel.

While the income on his fortune was reduced to a fraction of what it had been before the war, he still had to keep his London house and practice and his house in the country, and had to pay all the other obligations arising from his former standard of life, such as club fees, charity contributions, etc. This once-rich man could do this only with the aid of the salary of his daughters who were filling Government positions.

In addition, the participation of the Labour Party in the Churchill Government will mean that post-war legislation in Britain is bound to curtail the privileges of the propertied classes. The Labour Party can point to their patriotic attitude, in contrast with the attitude of the "appeasers," who belong mostly to the class of rich financiers or merchants.

The plight of the rich in Britain will be even greater than it was after the last World War. What will happen to those lovely castles and big estates in the South, in the Midlands, and in Scotland when there is no money to keep them?

Under pressure of all these circumstances, class differences in Britain are bound to be reduced. The impoverishment of the classes who used to send their children to exclusive schools will destroy the present British public-school system. National—that is, State or communal—education will have to take its place.

Though a system at least nominally capitalistic will be maintained, post-war Britain will be compelled to exercise strong State control over foreign exchange, and to introduce many nationalizing measures, such as the expropriation of the railroads by the State, and the nationalization of the mines. There probably will remain a control

of foreign trade and of the acquisition of raw materials, and the State will compel private companies to introduce rationalization measures. All this will tremendously weaken capitalism and will convert it to a semi-State-controlled form of capitalism. This, in turn, will bring the British economic structure one step nearer to the economic system of the dictators, even if capitalism survives as the chief basis of economic life.

Two major wars within one generation are bound to cause a complete change in the social and economic structure of any country, be it ever so rich. (This was Stalin's reason for wanting to push Western Europe into a war.) Let us hope that the change will come in Britain without a revolution, simply because the population will accept the *fait accompli* created by the war.

All this is what will happen if Britain succeeds in defeating her enemy. Should she suffer defeat, then everything will be different. The first consequence would be a Nazi régime that would fall completely in line with Nazi Germany. In that case not only would the totalitarian circle be enlarged by the entry of another State, but the enormous world-wide resources of the British Empire would be at the disposal of Germany and her satellites.

Just imagine the difficult situation that America would face! It is certain that she would be challenged sooner or later by this combination of Powers, for the very reasons which I explained in the previous chapter. If the United States should survive the assault, the two Americas probably, under clever and enlightened leadership, could work out a system in their own hemisphere which would assure the survival of the capitalist system, though in the form of a compromise between old-fashioned capitalism and a

planned economy, for some decades to come. The United States would then remain a stumbling-block in the way of the totalitarian régimes, because the slaves of National Socialism would not cease to hope. This would be a constant cause of fear for the dictators, and this is why they will have to strive to achieve a decisive victory over the New World. Feudalism in Europe survived for centuries because the feudal lords succeeded in defeating all their adversaries. Had one survived, the feudal régime could not have established itself as firmly as it did. The same holds good with National Socialist "feudalism"—it can survive only if all its opponents succumb.

Should the New World succumb to this assault of the dictators, a kind of National Socialist régime will be established all over the world. The world would be run by Germany, by German brains, German organizing ability, German terror, German brutality.

With blood and iron such a régime could keep itself in power all over the world for decades—perhaps. But it is more likely that it will not survive. Human love for freedom and independence, for the right to humane treatment and to civilized law and order, have always in the long run been stronger than the whips of the dictators.

But whether the revolution succeeds in spreading, terrible as many of its aspects may be, one must not think that all that it has brought, or is going to bring, is terrible. In the economic field capitalism has many sins, with its trade cycles, with its heartlessness, which often causes unemployment when there is no need for it, and its short-sightedness about human considerations. But neither German National Socialism, nor Russian Bolshevism, nor Italian corporative Fascism could establish a system which

would be better than old-fashioned capitalism. The life of the average worker in Britain or America towers above the standard of his colleagues in Europe. Capitalism has brought him wages which enable him in most cases to live at a decent standard, differing only in quality from that of his superiors.

While the life of workers in the democracies has improved, or at least has not worsened during recent years, the lot of the German, Russian, and Italian workers has deteriorated year after year, at least economically. Their food ration has been lowered, their requirements in textiles and other commodities could not be complied with.

If there is no more unrest abroad amongst the workers of the totalitarian countries, this is because, first, they have maintained certain social privileges such as paid holidays, after-work leisure arrangements, etc., and, second, because their social status has considerably improved. They are no longer, as in the days of Karl Marx, pushed by the bourgeoisie into a socially inferior position.

This abolition or elimination of class differences is the only absolutely practical and definite result of the present revolutions. It is true that to attain this almost everybody had to be reduced to the level of the lowest caste, instead of the rest being lifted. For this lowering, the possessing classes in post-war Europe must blame their own lack of understanding. They did not see the signs of the times; they failed to lift higher the lowest, and now they are being reduced to a low level themselves.

In an article which I wrote jointly with Miss Dorothy Thompson in 1921 in the *Nation*, entitled "Green Rising," we discussed the revolution which was going on amongst the peasants. We pointed out that in the revo-



lutions of 1918, as always was in the case of revolutions, those who sacrificed their lives for ideas, namely the town workers who were the revolutionaries in 1918, did not profit by them. The peasants, who looked phlegmatically on, however, profited.

We said that this increased influence of the peasant held in store for Europe both a promise and a threat. The promise was that this type of worker, who before the war was a kind of serf, had become a stabilizing influence. Another promise was that even if the peasant today supplies the silent support for the dictators, he remains a democrat at heart. This latent power in the peasantry may be helpful one day in restoring the democratic forms of government.

The peasants, however, could not gain more influence because it is so difficult to organize them; they can be organized, if at all, only on national lines. Furthermore, they are against culture; these are the drawbacks of the Green Rising.

Now the present revolutionary wave really has made great progress toward the social enfranchisement of the three oppressed classes, namely the peasants, the town workers, and the lower middle classes. In Russia this equalization was brought about by exterminating the higher middle class, and a large part of the lower middle classes and of the rich peasants. The former stiffness between the classes in Germany is being demolished by the efforts of Doctor Robert Ley, the Labour Front leader. In 1933, May 1, Europe's national labour holiday, Doctor Ley compelled the factory owners and industrialists to march with the workers. And now that the war is on, this equalizing process is being enlarged by the army: the

German army command in this war compels the officers to live and eat with the men. In Italy a similar equalization process is going on and the economic dispossession of the rich naturally contributes to the speed of this levelling process.

The recent victories of German arms have filled the world with alarm. But, as I pointed out, probably not all is well with the revolutions themselves. Otto Tolischus warns us that in spite of the hardships of the German working and other classes, owing to shortage of food and other commodities, there is, except in individual cases, nothing the matter with German working efficiency or working morale. He warns against pinning any hopes on discontent among the German workers.

This is true. Nevertheless, the European nations, once used to better conditions of life, will resent the oppressive labour régime imposed on them by the totalitarian dictators. The present stage of the revolution is the great levelling phase; the next will be the revolt of the masses for freedom. When will that come?

For thousands of years human beings have sacrificed their lives for ideals, for freedom, liberty, family, for religious and moral values. The dictators may find that perhaps their own methods will bring salvation from themselves.

The very magnitude of the German victory over France may be Pyrrhic. Not *vis-à-vis* France, which is hopelessly defeated for a long time to come. But the new German war methods may have their repercussion at home.

What is, after all, the secret of the power of the dictatorial and totalitarian régimes? Why was there no revolt against them? There were times when the population was seething with unrest in Russia, in Italy, in Germany, in

Spain. No doubt, the dictatorships try to maintain a certain popularity with the masses and keep their hands on the pulse of the population, whom they seek to pacify with cheap concessions. But the existence and the entire method of rule of these dictators undoubtedly creates serious opposition, among an important minority at least. This minority, determined and courageous, is, however, helpless because it is kept down by the modern weapons used to overcome popular resistance: the machine-gun.

In the old days the indignant masses, or minorities, used to storm the armoury, get hold of the rifles, and be equally matched with the army. But even at the beginning of this century the machine-gun made revolutions extremely difficult. The Russian revolution of 1905 succeeded only because the sailors of the cruiser *Potemkin* joined the revolutionaries, and a battleship can defeat the machine-gun. Germany in this war succeeded in France because she found methods to overcome the most dangerous weapon of the last war: German tanks and airmen defeated the machine-guns of France. Will the future revolution for liberty start with the revolt of the tank corps and the aviators against the machine-guns of Doctor Himmler? They certainly could overcome the police, the Gestapo, the G.P.U., or the Italian secret service.

The world was smiling when less than ten years ago a young Spanish officer, Captain Franco (younger brother of the present head of Spain), started a revolution against the monarchy in Spain by flying to rebel quarters. His "aerial" revolution of nine years ago may perhaps be the initiator of an idea which on a large scale will defeat the defenders of the present régimes in Russia, Germany, and Italy.

## POSTSCRIPT

WHEN I wrote this book in the summer of 1940, somewhere in the quiet hills of the State of Vermont, I thought that, unlike my previous book, it would never reach the British readers. I thought the war and the German bombing of the towns of the beautiful British Isles would cause such changes that people would be no longer in the mood to read, or that technical difficulties would make the printing of books impossible. From a distance one imagines things always to be more dreary than when experiencing the great days of trial together with a great people.

Mrs. Fodor and my son then came to join me—they had spent the last two years in England. My wife told me about the indomitable spirit of England, about the magnificent behaviour of the population, and of how it bore its suffering with a hopeful soul and a cheery heart. I should have known it: I was in England during the last war and I saw how a nation heroically bore the brunt of four years' sufferings. I remember during the last war the *London Times* wrote the following famous line in one of its leading articles: "The Germans may win the battles, but we will win the war." Today even the battles are being won—difficult, dreary battles in the air, battles in Egypt, battles on the sea.

Then came letters from my sister who lives only eight miles from London. "It is wonderful for the boys," she writes (she has two sons and a son-in-law) "to be able to pass through such a historic period as this, and in such a great place as wonderful old England."

## POSTSCRIPT

And then came the letter of Stanley Unwin about the publication of this book.

So it is today as in 1914-18: "business as usual." And I wish to write a few words to add to this book especially for my British readers.

There is, for example, one thing on which I want to enlarge in connection with the analysis of the German methods of warfare. And this is the German tactic of rehearsing the *Blitzkrieg*. I want to emphasize how important is the rehearsing of the lightning tactics, not only because the German troops must have sufficient practice, but also because a realistic rehearsal compels the enemy to show his cards. The first German "rehearsal" of this sort was the mobilization against Czechoslovakia on May 21, 1938, when undoubtedly large German troop contingents were concentrated near the Bohemian frontier. The purpose of this move was to force the Czechs to mobilize and watch how fast the Czech troops reached the frontier. Moreover, it was to study the possible attitude of Britain, France, and Russia in the event of a serious Germano-Czechoslovak crisis.

Before making the final totalitarian war in Western Europe the Germans carried through three rehearsals. First, on November 11, 1939, when the Dutch had to order mobilization in face of threatening German moves on their frontiers; second, on January 13, 1940, when Belgium was forced to increase her mobilization; and third, on April 5, 1940, just before the Norwegian invasion, when another "sham" move was made on the Belgian-German frontier in order to mislead the British and the French.

I want to add that I believe the Germans have been

using the same methods in their war against Britain. The Nazis were ready to invade Britain in August, and then for some reason they had to postpone this invasion. On September 16, 1940, the Germans made a very realistic move which, owing to the heavy losses they suffered, looked as if another invasion attempt had been frustrated. But I doubt if the Germans were ready to invade England in September. The weather in that month is too bad and the channel too tempestuous for any serious crossing with flat-bottomed barges such as the Germans intend to use. This September "invasion" attempt was, in my view, another "rehearsal," and the unusually large number of fighting planes used in those days over England were really scouting planes for taking photos and making observations of possible British counter-moves. The Germans must make such rehearsals to discover the British plans to oppose them, because in the true *Blitzkrieg* you must be (figuratively speaking) ten minutes quicker than your opponent.

I think the Germans will make further rehearsals in order to compel the British to show their cards; further, by these very realistic rehearsals they hope to prevent the despatch of British troops to such far-distant places such as Egypt and Greece.

It is generally the unusual and the novel features of a book which provokes most of the criticism. When in my book *South of Hitler*, the first edition of which was published in 1937, I forecast the coming German-Russian co-operation in the chapter "A New Spectre Looms on the Horizon," most critics, while praising the book, singled this chapter out for criticism. They said that I was seeing

## POSTSCRIPT

phantoms. Yet I based my forecast simply on the observation that the German régime was becoming more revolutionary and the Russian more nationalistic, and thus I assumed that the two revolutions would find each other. And they did. (It is also true that I foretold that because of the nationalist nature of both régimes they were bound later to clash, and I suggested that the spot where they are the most likely to clash was the Bosphorus, that is the Straits. This prophecy still holds good.)

My present friendly critics in the United States, amongst whom I have to mention such distinguished persons and intimate friends as Dorothy Thompson and Raymond Gram Swing, objected because I called Hitler's régime a revolution. This sentiment was best expressed in the title of a critique of my book in a New York afternoon paper: "Fodor calls Hitler's racket a revolution."

Well, let us avoid the faults of Edmund Burke and Thomas Carlyle. I loath and detest Hitler's régime as much as any of my afore-mentioned friends and I wish probably even more eagerly that its downfall should be swift and the punishment worthy of the crime. But passion is a bad counsellor. And if we want to know the truth (which is essential if we want to fight a disease) we have to face it without passion.

First, we have to revise our ideas and nomenclature about revolutions. We used to regard as revolution a forceful or forcible movement which sought to improve the lot of the world. We used to regard as revolution any forcible movement which was based on the action of the majority of the people. But one of the characteristics of our age of revolution is that it is influenced by the Sorelian philosophy and that, imbued with the Nietzschean idea of

contempt for the masses, and thus for the majority, it seeks to impose the will of a small yet determined minority upon the majority!

For example, after reading my book, Raymond Gram Swing wrote to me the following impression:

"I wish you were here so that I could discuss with you the free use of the word 'revolution' in discussing National Socialism. I am trying to clear my own mind on the validity of this word. Revolution is the transfer of power from a small class to a larger class, and therefore an extension of liberty. The transfer of power from a larger class to a smaller class is counter-revolution. The German social change has increased the power of the lower middle class, but it has done so at the sacrifice of liberty for far greater numbers. It is a mixture of a revolution and counter-revolution. I think one should be wary of accepting National Socialism as revolution."

The trouble nowadays is that we still identify counter-revolution with reaction. Franco in Spain is a reactionary, but Hitler and Mussolini are counter-revolutionaries. And I think it is better to realize that the revolution is a long-drawn and complicated process. It is like alternating electrical current, consisting of cyclic phases. In the same way the revolution consists of both the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary parts. Can you imagine the French revolution without Napoleon? I cannot. Yet Napoleon and the Consuls and the *Directoire* were counter-revolutionary apparitions.

Hitler and Mussolini fit into the present revolution just as Napoleon was part and parcel of the French revolution. The real results of the revolution are attained only after a long process of ups and downs, after repeated revolutions



## POSTSCRIPT

and counter-revolutions, and occasionally, even reactionary periods in between. The Bourbons were certainly a reaction, and not a counter-revolution! Indeed, the French revolution consisted just as much of the Abbé Sièyes, Lafayette, and Mirabeaus, as it did of the Dantons, St. Justs, Robespierres, Marats, of the Cordeliers, the Montagnards, the Girondists, and the Consuls, *Directoire*, and even Napoleon's Empire. In fact, the Bourbons and the Orléanists belonged to it too, despite their reactionary nature, just as much as the revolutions of 1830 and 1848.

We must make no mistake. We are only at the beginning of a very long revolutionary movement. Wars beget revolutions, and revolutions beget wars. And here we are in the midst of a war which began in another war which, in turn, produced a revolution. But we did not realize that this revolution was in progress in many places. We all looked towards Russia and believed that Russia was identical with the revolution. Yet since Stalin's accession, Russia has been only as much a part of the revolution as counter-revolutions are parts of the revolution. For Stalin's régime has become decidedly counter-revolutionary.

The German revolution of 1918 was, of course, also part of the revolution. Because of the compromising nature of the intelligent but not very passionate Social-Democratic leaders of Germany this revolution soon died out, or apparently did. But this was a mistaken observation. The revolution remained; only its carrying force, the working class, spent its energy. We did not realize that there was another revolutionary class in Europe besides the workers and this was the *petit bourgeoisie*. This bourgeoisie had a grievance.

We were used to regard the bourgeoisie and the *petit*

*bourgeoisie* as the typical representatives of the perpetuation of the old system of law and order. We did not realize that this class underwent a revolutionary change after the first World War. This class, typical defender of the rights of property, suffered greatly through the depreciation of currencies and through inflations. The German professor, doctor, grocer, and shopkeeper, who lost his savings in the inflation, was no longer a *par excellence* propagandist of the old order. He was a revolutionary. But he instinctively hated the working classes. His only advantage was a sort of social superiority over a class which fared as bad as the middle class. And the genius of Mussolini and Hitler was to offer them a counter-revolutionary movement which, however, was revolutionary enough to put this class on the map.

Let us therefore make no mistake. Hitler and Mussolini belong to the revolutionary cycle as much as Lenin and Stalin. But this does not mean that their aims will be the result of the revolution. For the time being the three National Socialist régimes, the Russian, German, and Italian, could not achieve any form of economic system which could replace capitalism. Over-centralization and slave labour are their chief characteristics, which may be useful in wartime but certain to fail in normal times.

For twenty-one years I have represented the *Manchester Guardian* in Central and South-Eastern Europe, and later in Western Europe. The *Manchester Guardian* was the most competent mouthpiece of a school which was named after the town where this great paper was produced. The philosophers of the Manchester school and its economics were the men who through long study and clever observation learned the lessons taught by the French revolution

## POSTSCRIPT

and expressed them in their political and economic principles. This political and economic liberalism then gave its hall-mark to the whole of Europe and the world during the nineteenth century and even at the beginning of the twentieth. These philosophers and economists were clever enough to see the signs of the times and to deduct the good things from a revolution which looked as horrid to the Burkes and Carlyles as the present revolution looks to us.

We must keep our eyes open and learn the lesson. Amongst the tares and weeds of the revolution there are a few grains of good wheat. Let us find them, and discard the tares, and thereby do the same service for future generations as the Ricardos and Stuart Mills did for the world of our grandfathers and great-grandfathers. But to act in this way, first we must realize what is the meaning of everything around us. If with my somewhat hurried study of the present revolution I have done some service to contribute to such a mental clarification, then I have already earned my reward.



# OVERLEAF

*particulars of publications  
of similar interest  
issued by*



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET

TORONTO: 91 WELLINGTON STREET WEST

BOMBAY: 15 GRAHAM ROAD, BALLARD ESTATE

WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 8 KINGS CRESCENT, LOWER HUTT

SYDNEY, N.S.W.: AUSTRALIA HOUSE, WYNARD SQUARE

# Europe's Dance of Death

by G. T. GARRATT

author of "*Mussolini's Roman Empire*," "*Gibraltar and the Mediterranean*," etc. 10s. 6d. net  
Demy 8vo

All over the world people are asking why the old ideals of freedom and democracy have failed so completely to prevent war or even to stop the general reversion of Europe to barbarism. This book attempts to show the reasons. The author discusses the practical working of democracy amongst the Great Powers, especially since the last war; he shows the stages by which democracy has given place everywhere to greater or lesser degrees of totalitarian rule; and he draws upon his first-hand knowledge of Abyssinia, Spain, and Czechoslovakia to explain the collapse of the Western democracies when faced with aggression. Finally he draws attention to certain sinister influences which have been at work and still continue.

"... this book is not just one more pungent study of recent politics. It is movingly personal, in a direct manner that Garratt has not used before, and it judges by experience and by facts as he has found them, and not by political theories, whether Right or Left."—*Time and Tide*

"The book is a brilliant analysis of Europe today. In my opinion, in spite of its pessimistic tone, it is the best that has been written."—*The Tribune*

## From Versailles to Danzig

La. Cr. 8vo

by CLAUD GOLDING

7s. 6d. net

Claud Golding, whose work has been famous to readers of the *London Evening Standard* for many years, tells in a series of dramatic chapters the story of the peace that was not peace. It is a record of all those tragic events from November 1918 that have led at last to the renewal of the conflict between Germany and her old enemies.

"Claud Golding has a graphic pen. . . . The events leading up to the war make an ideal subject for him. They go by like a thrilling news-reel in his *From Versailles to Danzig*, gathering impetus and menace till they break in the final crash. Here is the war made popularly plain."—*Evening Standard*

## Road to Disaster

by ERNST KLEIN

Demy 8vo

Translated by Denis Weaver

12s. 6d. net

"... this is no mere study based on the mass of published material available. As the correspondent of an important Swiss newspaper, and an Austrian intelligence officer during the war, Herr Klein had exceptional opportunities for personal observation of conditions and happenings all over Central and Eastern Europe and was brought into touch with the leading personalities in all the capitals from Berlin to Constantinople. It is this that gives the book its peculiar interest, not only as a record of the past, but as in some sort a guide for the future."—*The Times Literary Supplement*

"... a brilliant and learned book."—*News Chronicle*

---

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD



12124





12124

